Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Dr. Arthur C. Core

Papers

of the

American Society of Church History

Second Series

Volume I.

Report and Papers of the First Meeting of the Reorganized Society, and of its First Annual Meeting, Held in the City of New York, Dec. 27 and 28, 1906, and Dec. 26 and 27, 1907, Respectively

Edited by

Samuel Macauley Jackson

Secretary

LIBRARY OF
BR
140.5
.A531
1913
V.1
33,012

Reprinted together with new material:

The Letters of Einhard in English Translation

G. P. Putnam's Sons

New York and London

The Knickerbocker Press

1913

Copyright, 1909
BY
SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON

Copyright, 1913
BY
WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL

Two hundred and fifty copies of this corrected reprint have been made from type, which has been destroyed.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CONSTITUTION	V
THE MEETING FOR ORGANIZATION } Report of the . .	I
THE FIRST ANNUAL MEETING } Secretary . .	4
THE ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, WILLISTON WALKER, AT THE FIRST ANNUAL MEETING: "THE CURRENT OUTLOOK IN CHURCH HISTORY" . .	15
TENDENCY TOWARDS CENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY AMONG AMERICAN CONGREGATIONALISTS AND BAPTISTS . . . . . By Henry Kalloch Rowe	33
RECENT RESEARCHES IN HOLLAND AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL RECORDS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK By Edward Tanjore Corwin	51
THE GENESIS OF THE PRESENT CUSTOMARY FORM OF PUBLIC WORSHIP IN THE REFORMED NON-PRELATICAL CHURCHES OF AMERICA . . . By Williston Walker	79
BASIL AND JEROME COMPARED . . . . . By John Lewis Ewell	93
LIST OF MEMBERS (1908)	103
DECEASED MEMBERS (1908)	106
THE LETTERS OF EINHARD . . . . . Translated by Henry Preble Annotated by Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr.	107

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

I.

This Society shall be called The American Society of Church History.

II.

Its object shall be the promotion of studies in the department of Church History.

III.

The officers shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall be elected by ballot at the annual meeting.

No President shall be elected to succeed himself.

These officers, the ex-Presidents and two other members to be elected annually, shall constitute the Council, of which three shall be the quorum.

The Council may fill vacancies until the next annual meeting.

IV.

The duties of the persons just named shall be respectively as follows:

The President, or in his absence the Vice-President, shall preside at all meetings of the Society. In the absence of these officers, the Society may choose a temporary president from the members present.

The Secretary shall notify the members at least two weeks in advance of each meeting, keep the minutes, and conduct the correspondence of the Society under the direction of the Council.

The Treasurer shall send bills regularly to all annual members, take charge of the funds of the Society, and invest and disburse them under the direction of the Council.

The Council shall be charged with the general interests of the Society including the election of members, the calling of meetings, the selection of papers, the arrangement of programs, the determination of papers to be published, and the auditing of the Treasurer's accounts.

V.

The members shall be either active or sustaining. The annual fee for active members shall be Three Dollars; for sustaining members, Ten Dollars. On payment of One Hundred Dollars at any one time any member may become a life-member exempt from fees.

VI.

One copy of each of the publications of the Society, issued after their election, shall be sent to all life-members, and to all other members not in arrears for more than two years, and to all libraries subscribing Three Dollars annually.

VII.

The Society shall meet annually at such time and place as the Council may determine. Special meetings may be called at the discretion of the Council. Ten members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may sit for the purpose of hearing and discussing papers presented.

VIII.

This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any annual meeting, provided that notice of such amendment shall be given at the preceding annual meeting, or the amendment itself shall be approved by the Council before the meeting at which it shall be voted upon.

THE ORGANIZATION MEETING OF THE REVIVED AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

Report of the Secretary

THE organization meeting of the revived American Society of Church History was held in Room 415, of the Library of Columbia University, New York City. There were two sessions—the first at 3 P.M., Thursday, December 27, 1906. Mr. Samuel Macauley Jackson called the meeting to order and announced that the business was to adopt a constitution and choose officers and councilors for the Society. He suggested that as the basis for discussion the constitution of the old Society be taken, read article by article, and such changes be made as seemed desirable. This was done and after a two hours' discussion the revised constitution was adopted unanimously (see above, Constitution). There were present at this session the following gentlemen: J. C. Ayer, Jr., J. Carter, E. T. Corwin, J. L. Ewell, J. A. Faulkner, Barr Ferree, J. I. Good, G. E. Horr, S. M. Jackson, C. M. Jacobs, F. J. Kinsman, A. C. McGiffert, J. Nicum, G. Norcross, W. W. Rockwell, H. J. Weber.

After the adoption of the constitution, Messrs. Corwin, McGiffert, and Jackson were elected a Committee on Nomination of Officers and Councilors to report the next morning.

The Second Session was held in the same place at 10 A.M. on Friday, December 28, 1906. There were present: Messrs. J. C. Ayer, Jr.; E. T. Corwin, J. L. Ewell, J. A. Faulkner, J. I. Good, G. E. Horr, S. M. Jackson, W. P.

Ladd, A. C. McGiffert, E. W. Miller, J. Nicum, G. Norcross, W. W. Rockwell, C. C. Sherman, J. D. Steele, W. Walker.

The Committee on Nominations reported as follows:

For President, Williston Walker; Vice-President, Henry Eyster Jacobs; Secretary, Samuel Macauley Jackson; Treasurer, Barr Ferree; Councilors, Francis Albert Christie and Frederick Joseph Kinsman.

One ballot was cast by the chairman of the committee for the ticket thus nominated and the persons named were declared duly elected to serve as officers and council for the year. The President then took the chair and the reading of papers was begun.

The first paper was "Pessimism in the Heathen World and in the Early Christian Church," by J. C. Ayer, Jr., and was briefly discussed by Messrs. Horr, Miller, and Walker.

The second paper was "Recent Researches in Holland and the *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York*," by E. T. Corwin.

On its conclusion the Secretary offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

"The American Society of Church History, in session assembled, having learned with pleasure that all the volumes entitled the *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York* have now been published under the supervision of the Hon. Hugh Hastings, the State Historian, would express their gratitude and their appreciation of the enterprise and generosity of the State. But as an index volume is essential to the use of these records they would respectfully petition the Legislature to authorize the immediate preparation of such an index volume, and would further venture to recommend that the Rev. Dr. Edward Tanjore Corwin be asked to make this index inasmuch as he has gathered most of the material and has unique acquaintance with it."

The third paper was "Basil and Jerome Compared,"

by J. L. Ewell. After the general discussion the following resolution was adopted:

"That a committee consisting of the President, the Secretary, and J. I. Good, be chosen to take such action as may be appropriate in connection with the committee arranging for the celebration in Geneva in 1909 of the fourth centenary of the birth of John Calvin."

The fourth and concluding paper was "The Genesis of the Present Customary Form of Public Worship in the Reformed Non-Prelatical Churches of America," by Williston Walker.

At 1 P.M., the Society adjourned to meet at the time and place determined by the Council.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON,
Secretary.

THE FIRST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE REORGANIZED AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

Report of the Secretary

THE Society met for its first annual meeting since its reorganization at half-past eight o'clock in the evening of Thursday, December 26, 1907, in Room 301, University Hall, Columbia University, New York City, and was called to order by the President, Williston Walker, who offered prayer. He then delivered the address which is printed on the following pages.

The paper of the evening was by Arthur Cushman McGiffert, on "The Dawn of the Modern Age." This he put in the eighteenth century, for it was then first that the modern man appears. The man of the Renascence and the Reformation was still in the shackles of medievalism. As the paper is to appear in a volume, it cannot be published here.

The paper was briefly discussed by Messrs. Ewell and Walker.

The remainder of the session was given up to business. The Secretary made his report, in which after detailing his efforts to enlarge the membership in the Society he paid his tribute to the memory of the three members who had died during the year, as follows:

The first to leave us was that man whom we were accustomed to call by his full name, Leonard Woolsey Bacon. He died at Assonet, Mass., on Sunday, May 12, 1907. It was my good fortune to know him quite well.

He has been a guest of mine on many occasions, and it was my great privilege for six months to sit under his preaching. The outline of his life can be given in a few words. Born at New Haven, Conn., on Friday, January 1, 1830, the son of that leader in New England, Leonard Bacon, he possessed a strong character and early displayed marked ability. His college education was received in his native town, and he became a B.A. of Yale in 1850. During 1851 and 1852 he studied in Andover Theological Seminary, and then went to Yale Divinity School, from which he was graduated in 1854. Not satisfied with finding out all he could of theology he studied medicine at the Yale Medical School and was graduated as a doctor of medicine in 1855. His practice was of short duration, if he ever did practice, for in 1856 he became pastor of St. Peter's Presbyterian Church in Rochester, N. Y., a less notable thing for a scion of the purest Congregational stock and son of the great Congregational leader to do in those days of union between Congregationalists and Presbyterians in home missionary work in our rapidly expanding country than it would have been afterwards. The next year he returned to the fold of his fathers and became pastor of the Congregational Church of Litchfield, Conn. Thus he early evinced that roving disposition and indifference to denominational names which ever characterized him, for he was afterwards pastor or preacher in many pulpits, and of several denominations, including that of the American church in Geneva, Switzerland. My first contact with him was some twenty years ago, while the Marble Collegiate Church in New York City was in the pastorless condition between the departure of Dr. Ormiston and the coming of Dr. Burrell. Such preaching as he gave us for those six months I never had and never have listened to. Such eloquence, such Bible exposition, such testimony to truth and righteousness were not found in any other pulpit in the city at the time.

For many years he was a frequent contributor to the

periodical press, widely quoted and much sought after by editors. He published some volumes of collected papers and sermons, and one excellent, even masterly, history of American Christianity (1897), which was the concluding volume of the series of denominational histories which this Society in its first shape brought out in connection with the now defunct Christian Literature Company. In this volume, he showed that when he set himself to do his best and did some sober studying he could produce work of permanent value. Another of his sober and readable productions is his little book on the history of Congregationalism (1904), which he contributed to the series entitled "Story of the Churches." He had long been working spasmodically on a biography of his father, of whom he always spoke with great reverence. But I fear that he worked on too large a scale and left little of it in shape to be published. At the time of his death, he was investigating by request of Mr. H. H. Rogers, its vice-president, the general conduct of the Standard Oil Company, which under the circumstances seemed to me to be the most humorous thing Dr. Bacon ever did.

In this Society, Dr. Bacon took great interest and was fertile in suggesting how it might be made astonishingly attractive. He was asked, even urged, to be a contributor to our proceedings, but approaching death dulled his energy and he had nothing, he declared, to send. In him we lose one of rare intellect, warm heart, generous impulse, sparkling wit and whimsical humor. He was a friend of faith in God and man, an eloquent preacher, an inspiration in right living, one who through a long life did good service for Jesus Christ.

The next death to be here referred to was that of Dr. Krotel, another of the faithful friends of the old Society. Most of the biographical details to be here given come from the memorial sketch which appeared of him in *The Lutheran*, of which he was editor, for May 23, 1907, sup-

plemented by the anonymous memoir, issued apparently by his church.

GOTTLOB FREDERICK KROTEL, was born in Ilsfeld,[1] some twenty-five miles due east of Karlsruhe, the capital of the Grand Duchy of Baden, on Sunday, February 4, 1826. The original name of the family was Krodel. His father was Christopher Frederick and his mother's maiden name was Louisa Dorothea Seitz. Ilsfeld is now only a village of some two thousand inhabitants, and probably was much smaller eighty years ago. He could have retained little recollection of it, for when he was four years old he was taken by his parents to America. They settled in Philadelphia and connected themselves with Old Zion's Lutheran Church. He was educated in Philadelphia, first in the parochial school sustained by Old Zion's and St. Michael's churches, known as the Franckean Academy, until 1836, when he was apprenticed to the printer, L. A. Wollenweber. In 1839 he entered the academical department of the University of Pennsylvania. He entered the freshman class of that university in 1842, and the same year was confirmed in Old Zion's Church. During his college course he resolved to be a minister, and so on graduation he studied theology under his pastor, the Rev. Dr. Karl Rudolph Demme (1795–1863), and in 1848 was licensed at Easton, by the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania. He took charge of Trinity Church, Passayunk, now part of Philadelphia, during 1848 and 1849. In the latter year he married Miss Elizabeth McGarry of Philadelphia, and became pastor of Salem Church, Lebanon, Pa., in connection with churches in Myerstown and Annville. In 1850 he was ordained by the body which had licensed him. He early won a reputation for pulpit oratory and was equally at home in German and English, but from 1853 when he became pastor of Holy Trinity in Lancaster, Pa., he preached well-nigh exclusively in English and was henceforth identified with the English

[1] Not Alsfeld, as frequently stated, which is in Hesse.

Lutherans. While at Lancaster, he introduced (or rather reintroduced) the wearing of the gown and the new liturgical service of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. He was a pronounced Union man, yet had as his auditor while at Lancaster President James Buchanan. It is related that on one occasion, Mr. Buchanan left the church during the general prayer because Mr. Krotel prayed for the abolition of slavery.

In 1861 Mr. Krotel became pastor of St. Mark's in Philadelphia. In 1868 he removed to New York City. His first charge was Holy Trinity, which was then on Twenty-first Street between Fifth and Sixth Avenues, and he was there till 1895, when he retired to East Orange, N. J. He then became editor-in-chief of *The Lutheran*. In 1896 he yielded to the wishes of some members of his old congregation and started a work, on the upper west side of the Borough of Manhattan, New York City, which developed into the Church of the Advent on the corner of Broadway and Ninety-third Street, and he was the pastor and preacher there from 1900 till his death. He was getting ready to go to the preparatory service on Friday, May 17, 1907, when he was stricken with apoplexy and died in twenty minutes.

He did much work besides that mentioned. He edited *Der Lutherische Herold*, from 1872 to 1875, *The Lutheran*, from 1881 to 1883, and again from 1896 till his death. He played a large part in the formation of the General Council Lutherans, and was a professor in the theological seminary which they started in Philadelphia from its foundation in 1864 till his removal to New York. He held every high office his brethren had to bestow. He did something—much indeed, all things considered—in the way of book publication: An explanation in German of the Constitution of the United States (Philadelphia: L. A. Wollenweber, 1846), and in connection with Rev. Professor Dr. W. J. Mann, an explanation in English of Luther's *Small*

Catechism (1863); independently, a translation of K. F. Ledderhose's life of Melanchthon (1854), and one of J. G. W. Uhlhorn's *Luther and the Swiss* (1876), and one volume which was strictly original and individual, entitled, *Who are the Blessed? Meditations on the Beatitudes*, which he published as far back as 1856. He received the honorary degree of doctor of divinity from the University of Pennsylvania in 1865, and that of doctor of laws from Mühlenberg College in 1888.

The last to leave us was Archdeacon Tiffany. He departed this life on Tuesday, August 20, 1907, at Northeast Harbor, Maine. He was born in Baltimore, Maryland, Monday, October 5, 1830. His full name was CHARLES COMFORT TIFFANY, and it always seemed to me that he lived out his middle name. He impressed you as a true man, a gentle man, accustomed to refined surroundings and ample means, yet one who was sympathetic, as such persons often are, with those less rich in this world's goods. He was exceedingly agreeable in conversation, and his volume on the Protestant Episcopal Church in the American Church History Series (1895) showed that if he had devoted himself to writing more than he did, he would have produced scholarly and acceptable books. He was graduated from Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., in 1850. He then studied in Andover Theological Seminary, where he was a classmate of Leonard Woolsey Bacon, and there graduated in 1854. On his return from travel and study abroad he entered the Congregational ministry and was pastor at Derby, Conn., from 1857 to 1863, when he left to be chaplain of the 6th Connecticut Regiment, U. S. Volunteers, and served till the close of the war. During 1865–6 he traveled abroad. He then entered the Episcopal Communion, became successively rector of St. James's, Fordham, New York, 1866; assistant in Trinity Church, Boston, having charge of St. Mark's Church, 1871; rector of the Church of the Atonement, New York City, 1874; of Zion Church, 1880, and was largely

instrumental in uniting it with St. Timothy's in 1890.[1] From 1893 to 1902, he was Archdeacon of New York. His health compelled his resignation. He received the honorary degree of doctor of divinity from Dickinson College, 1883; from St. Stephen's College, 1883; and from Yale College, 1897. He left considerable wealth, which he willed to benevolent purposes, much of it as a memorial to his wife who had died years before.

In the absence of the Treasurer, the Secretary read the former's report which was as follows:

RECEIPTS:

March 23 to Dec. 24, 1907.	$154.20

DISBURSEMENTS:

Knickerbocker Press, printing.	$60.40	
D. R. Thompson, rubber stamp.	.65	
Bank collection charges.	.50	61.55
Balance on hand, Dec. 24, 1907.		$92.65

On motion this report was referred to Messrs. Kinsman and Jacobs for audit.

As the Committee on Nomination for the ensuing year, the President appointed Messrs. Ewell and Rockwell.

After a discussion, generally participated in, upon the ways in which a Society like this could be particularly serviceable and after several suggestions had been made, the President on motion appointed Messrs. Good, Christie, and Rockwell a committee to take the plans suggested into consideration and report the next day. With this action the session closed.

The next session was at half-past ten on Friday morning, December 27th. The first paper was by Henry Kalloch Rowe, on "The Tendency towards Centralization of Author-

[1] See *History of the Church of Zion and St. Timothy of New York*, New York, 1894.

ity among Congregationalists and Baptists." It is given in the following pages.

It was discussed by Messrs. Christie, Walker, Jacobs, Ewell, Good, Jackson, Corwin, and Faulkner.

The second and concluding paper was by Austin Baxter Keep, Ph.D., on "The First Parochial Library in New York City." As it forms part of section one, ("The Bray Foundation, or the Library of Trinity Parish") of the introduction, ("The Library in Colonial New York, 1698–1776") to the *History of the New York Society Library, Founded in 1754*, prepared by him and published by the trustees at the De Vinne Press, New York, 1908, it cannot be given here in its entirety, but Mr. Keep has kindly furnished the following outline of it:

Through the efforts of the Rev. Thomas Bray, D.D. (1656–1730), the revered founder of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, numerous collections of religious books were sent to found parochial libraries in the American colonies. The first of these was established at Annapolis in 1697. That same year a consignment of some 220 volumes went to New York under the care of Lord Bellomont, the lately-appointed royal governor; and in June, 1698, the collection was formally ensconced in the newly-dedicated Trinity Church building as the Library of Trinity Parish. Here it remained, reinforced to about 450 volumes by small donations of serious and devotional works from Dr. Bray, from the Bishop of London, and other pious individuals, until its virtual destruction in the great fire of September, 1776, that ushered the horrors of war into New York. This library, though designated "provincial" in its original catalogue, and even styled "publick" in the vestry minutes of Old Trinity, was kept for his own use by the Rev. William Vesey, D.D. (b. 1674; became the first rector of Trinity Church 1697; d. 1746), and never became established by statute like similar institutions in Maryland and the Carolinas. It was too exclusively churchly and somber

in character to be generally acceptable in a community where confusion of tongues prevailed, and where the Anglican element was avowedly unpopular. Furthermore the Knickerbockers were so deeply engrossed in their business and political concerns as not unnaturally to prefer out-of-door pastimes to excursions in theology. Some twenty volumes of this old library may be seen to-day in the library of the General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, having experienced fire and dispersion, captivity and various wanderings—a truly dramatic story. It is fitting that those few survivors of an old Church of England parish library, founded in pious zeal for the use of the clergy, should be given a final asylum in the library of an institution devoted to the training of young men for the Episcopal ministry.

At the close of this session the members met for luncheon in the University refectory.

The last session was opened at three o'clock that afternoon. The several committees previously appointed, as noted, made their reports:

I. The Committee on Audit reported through its chairman that it had found the Treasurer's accounts correct.

II. The Committee on the Work of the Society reported through its chairman as follows:

"Your Committee on the Work of the Society would report that three subjects have been referred to them: 1. The preparation of an American bibliography of church history; 2. The preparation of a general survey of American church history; 3. Conference with the different denominations in our country as to their historical societies and also calling their attention to the importance of gathering together the historical material of their churches.

"On the first subject your committee would suggest the appointment of the following committee, viz.: Messrs. Jackson, Christie, and Rockwell.

"On the second, they suggest the appointment of the following committee, viz.: Messrs. Walker, Jackson, and Simpson.

"On the third point, they would also suggest the appointment of a committee."

On motion this report was accepted and adopted and on further motion the President, Mr. Good, and the Secretary were chosen to carry out the third recommendation.

III. The Nominating committee reported the following choice of officers and councilors for the ensuing year:

President: Henry Eyster Jacobs.
Vice-President: Francis Albert Christie.
Treasurer: Barr Ferree.
Secretary: Samuel Macauley Jackson.
Councilors: Edward Tanjore Corwin and Henry Kalloch Rowe.

The report was accepted and the Secretary was instructed to cast one ballot for the nominations made therein, whereupon the Chair declared that these persons constituted the officers and councilors for the ensuing year.

The new president was then inducted into office by his predecessor.

A general discussion followed upon the methods of instruction in church history and the members gave their experience. This brought out the need of a comprehensive source-book in church history, and the matter was referred to the Committee on Bibliography, already named, consisting of Messrs. Jackson, Christie, and Rockwell, for their consideration.

On motion, the President of Columbia University was thanked for having so kindly given the Society its place of meeting.

No further business offering, the Society then adjourned.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON,
Secretary.

The Current Outlook in Church History

By

Williston Walker

THE CURRENT OUTLOOK IN CHURCH HISTORY

By Williston Walker, Professor of Church History, Yale University

(*The Presidential Address, Read December 26, 1907*)

ONE of the duties of the office of President of this Society, to which you did me the honor to elect me for the year that has just closed, is to give an annual address. Its theme is, fortunately for the speaker, almost of necessity prescribed by the purposes of the Society and the nature of the office to which your kindness has chosen me, and he deems it, therefore, no less his duty than his privilege to bring before you in rapid survey, and in brief and inadequate outline, indeed, the principal events of the year which has elapsed since the last meeting of this Society, in so far as they relate themselves to its purpose, viz., the cultivation of church history.

While the year that is just closing has been marked by a considerable number of occurrences of significance, and has brought its proportion of contributions to the discussion of historical questions, it has not been distinguished either by events, or by publications, of unusual importance. It may fairly be described as an average year in its relations to church history.

There have been, however, three commemorations of significant anniversaries which have taken place during the past year and deserve mention among its occurrences. The first of these was the Centenary Conference of Protest-

ant Missions in [6][1] China, held in Shanghai, in April and May, the occasion being the one hundredth anniversary of the beginnings of the work, in that great empire, of Robert Morrison. It was far, indeed, from being the centennial of Christian missions in the Chinese Empire, for Roman Catholic effort is greatly older; but for Protestant Christendom, the event was certainly one of significance; and the commemoration, involving, as it did, the gathering together of representatives of all Protestant Mission Boards at present at work in China, and the discussion not merely of the history but of the present problems of missions, was on a scale worthy of the importance of the anniversary. A second commemoration of significance was that held in Jamestown and Richmond by the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in October, in which the three hundredth anniversary of the introduction of the Church of England by the first settlers of Virginia was appropriately brought to mind. The third commemoration attached itself, also, to an event, though of comparatively minor importance, in the history of the same communion, when, on June 12th, the two hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut was worthily observed in Stratford in that state.

Among English-speaking Protestants, the year which has just closed may be described as characterized by the increasing manifestation of the spirit of union. In Scotland, where the juncture effected in 1900 between the Free and the United churches was followed by the refusal of a few congregations of the Free Church to join in the new communion, and the remarkable legal decision by which the property of the old Free Church as a whole was assigned to them, the year has witnessed the successful inauguration of the work

[1] The figures in brackets give the pagination of the former edition of these *Papers*.

of a parliamentary commission by which substantial justice will undoubtedly be done to all parties and reasonably equitable division of the properties involved is being effected, so that the union of these two great, closely-related bodies of Scottish Christians, though still involving some sacrifice, will not be accompanied by the embarrassing pecuniary losses which at one time threatened. In Canada, union efforts looking towards [7] the association of Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Methodists are in a high degree of advancement, and in New Zealand similar attempts have been auspiciously inaugurated. In the United States, the Northern Branch of the Presbyterian Communion and the Cumberland Presbyterians met, on May 16th, in Columbus, Ohio, in one General Assembly; and though the union thus inaugurated still encounters a very considerable degree of dissent, and by no means commands the support of all churches, perhaps of not more than of two thirds of the Cumberland churches, it is important for what it has already achieved and what it promises as to the future. The year has witnessed extensive negotiations looking towards the affiliation in one religious denomination of Congregationalists, United Brethren, and Methodist Protestants: but, though this effort has elicited much discussion, it has yet led to no definite results, and its outcome is still somewhat problematical. A step of significance for the relations of the Episcopal Communion with other religious bodies was taken by the convention of the Episcopal Church at its session in Richmond, when Episcopal pulpits were opened, under certain restrictions, for the preaching of ministers of other communions—a privilege, expressive of Christian fellowship, of which use is already being made. A prime characteristic, therefore, of the year which is just closing, as of several previous years among English-speaking Protestant Christians, is the development of the spirit of interdenominational fellowship—a tendency which the next few years is likely to see increased rather than diminished.

Outside of English-speaking Christendom, an event of some historic interest has been the separation, this autumn, of Church and State in the canton of Geneva. The historic territorial church which has been established since the Reformation, and upon which Calvin left permanent impress, has been disestablished by a small majority of the Genevan electors—a result which was the practically inevitable consequence of the multiplication in Geneva itself of adherents of other communions, primarily of that of Rome, and to some extent of the presence there of representatives of types of Protestantism other than that of the Establishment. Each canton of Switzerland has its [8] peculiar ecclesiastical constitution and its territorial church. The numbers, therefore, involved in this separation are not large, and the action taken involves no other canton; but, in view of the historic significance of the Genevan church, the event is one of considerable importance.

The most significant occurrences of the year relate themselves, as in several years past, to the great Roman Communion, and in that body the events of the year 1907 must make the period which is just closing a memorable epoch. A year ago the situation of the Catholic Church in France was the chief concern. The law for the separation of Church and State, enacted on December 9, 1905, went into effect upon its passage, and since that time the French Catholic Church has been disestablished; but practically it was not until about the time of our meeting last year, that is, until one year after the passage of this law, that its complete operation was effected. A year of grace was given, under the new statute, for the formation of new societies for the maintenance of worship, the so-called *associations cultuelles*. Its provisions for an inventory of religious property met with not a little popular opposition. The exclusion of the religious orders and congregations was accomplished with some considerable hardship, and the situation was much embittered by the refusal of the papacy to sanction the

associations which the law provided for the maintenance of worship. That attitude of rejection assumed by the papacy has continued, its main motives being undoubtedly the refusal by the French government to consider the papacy as in any sense a party to an agreement affecting the interests of the Church within the bounds of France, and the insistence of that government that the status of the French Church is purely a national question, regarding which it declines to give the papacy a share in the negotiations. The result has been that the now disestablished Church of France has occupied a position of painful legal uncertainty for the past year; but, thanks to the good sense of the government in refusing to force an issue, no serious disturbances have taken place, and disestablishment has become an accomplished fact. Perhaps the most significant feature of the transaction, from [9] the point of view of the religious future of the French nation, is the comparatively small degree of internal disturbance by which the great separation has been accompanied. The Roman Catholic Church of France has found its situation one of distressing financial embarrassment; but not without its aspects of encouragement. The response of the laity to the new burdens laid upon them has not been so generous as to make the situation an easy one, but it has been, nevertheless, considerable. Public worship has been everywhere maintained, candidates for the priesthood have continued to present themselves in respectable, if in somewhat decreasing, numbers; and it seems to be only a question of a relatively brief time before the Roman Catholic communion in France will have adjusted itself, successfully, to its new position. Should there be a change in its irreconcilable attitude on the part of papacy, there can be no doubt that the adjustment would be speedily accomplished. The Protestants of France who, like their Roman Catholic fellow-Christians, share in the trials and disadvantges of disestablishment, are meeting their perplexities with courage and good sense.

Of much greater significance than this question of disestablishment, which loomed so large a year ago, has been the completion, during the past year, of a process of separation in the intellectual attitude of two important sections of the Roman communion, which has been ripening for a considerable time. A movement for freer adjustment between Catholic doctrine and modern thought in science, history, and philosophy has undoubtedly been rapidly claiming adherents. It has found able champions during the past few years in such men as the late Professor Herman Schell of the University of Würzburg, and Freiherr Georg von Hertling of the University of Munich, in Germany; in the Abbé Loisy and Father Albert Houtin in France; and Father George Tyrrell in Great Britain. Some of these had already come under papal discipline. A movement to erect a monument to Professor Schell had already encountered papal opposition; but, in spite of these signs of disapproval, the religious world was hardly prepared for the publication by the "Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition," under [10] papal authority, on July 3d, of the so-called Syllabus, "Lamentabili sane exitu," which was followed on September 8th, by the now famous papal Encyclical, "Pascendi dominici gregis," or more appropriately, "De Modernistarum Doctrinis"; and, on November 18th, by a "Motu Proprio" regarding Biblical studies and enforcing the Encyclical.

In these lengthy and elaborate ecclesiastical pronunciamentos the positions of those Catholic scholars who would interpret their faith in the light of modern science, philosophy, and history, are denounced, and to a certain extent, undoubtedly, unfairly stated. Modernism is pronounced a "synthesis of all heresies," and a vigorous anti-modernistic campaign is ordered to be inaugurated with weapons that, to a Protestant at least, sound strangely mediæval. Modernists are to be removed from teaching positions, the clergy and laity are forbidden to read modernistic publications. A committee of examination and censorship is to be estab-

lished in every diocese; no clergyman is to assume the direction of publications without his bishop's permission; ecclesiastical conventions shall meet but rarely, and they are not to discuss matters affecting the episcopate or the higher interests of the church, and a "Council of Vigilance" is to be founded in every diocese to combat modern errors.

It is probably true that this drastic action is largely the work of a faction in the Roman Church, and the actual authorship of the Encyclical has been traced with a considerable degree of certainty. But there can be no doubt, also, that it represents an earnest pastoral desire on the part of the present Pope, who feels himself charged, as might the rector of a country congregation in France or Italy, with the repression of what he deems errors springing up among his flock. It has, nevertheless, brought into prominence a controversy which is apparently irreconcilable in the Roman Church itself, between widely held conceptions of the modern world and those of the thirteenth century; and while we may regard the evident manifestation of this division in thought and the action of the papacy towards it, as the prime ecclesiastical event of the year 1907, he would be a rash prophet, in view of the history of the [11] Roman Church, who would venture to predict what the outcome may be.

Turning now to the literature of Church History during the present year, we are met with one important discovery, viz., that of the *Treatise of Irenæus on the Apostolic Preaching*. This long-lost work, in which Irenæus sets forth familiar doctrinal positions and which, therefore, enlarges but little, if at all, our knowledge of the second century, was discovered in Armenian translation, and was issued in German, under Harnack's auspices, by two Armenian scholars, Karapet Ter-Mekerttschian and Earwand Ter-Minassiantz (Leipzig, 1907). The excavations of Egypt have yielded, besides a document of great interest to Old Testament scholars, showing that an elaborate Jewish temple, with sacrifices

and ritual worship, existed on the island of Elephantiné before the Persian conquest of Egypt, a fragment of a conversation between Christ and a Pharisee, probably a third-century document, though I am not aware that it has yet been published.

The completion of the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, in 1906, has been followed, this year, by the publication of the first two volumes of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1907); and the third (Albert Hauck's) edition of the great *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theologie und Kirche* is now slowly nearing completion, having made progress from Stephen III to Urban II during the year. Several important encyclopedic undertakings are in progress in this country, of which the most significant is the extensive work based upon the *Realencyklopädie*, of which the Secretary of this Society is Editor. During the year the Pope has ordered a new edition of the Vulgate to be prepared by Benedictine scholars, which will probably involve the labor of perhaps a decade before it is ready for publication.

The year has not been especially fruitful in the publication of sources. The most conspicuous recent work of this sort now in full progress, belonging, indeed, so far as the publication of its initial volume is concerned, to 1906, is the new *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (Volume I, *Italia*, Rome and Berlin, 1906; Volume II, *Latium*, 1907), by Paul Fridolin Kehr, under the auspices of the Göttinger Gesellschaft der [12] Wissenschaften. This work, which will undoubtedly supersede Jaffé and other collections of papal documents, is arranged geographically; and the investigations which have thus far been made regarding Italy, which is the first region considered, have yielded no less than 1154 heretofore unpublished charters and documents.

The first volume of the monumental *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum* has been issued under the editorship of Chester David Hartranft, long President of Hartford Theological Seminary (Leipzig, 1907). This work will make available

for the student of the Reformation age a wealth of unpublished material by and relating to Kaspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig, and is a monument to the interest of the Schwenckfelder Church of America in its founder.

Students of Church History will note with interest that a survey of the recent literature of the subject, that promises to be permanent, has been begun in the November number of the French *Revue Historique*, which has hitherto been largely secular in tone, by Charles Guignebert of the University of Paris, whose *Manuel d'histoire ancienne du Christianisme* (Paris, 1906), has shown his mastery of the literature and present status of discussion of early Christian history. Professor Harnack has turned aside from his more usual field, and has followed his defense of the Lucan authorship of the third Gospel and of the Acts, of a year ago (*Lucas der Arzt*, Leipzig, 1906), with an attempted reconstruction of the Logia sources of the Gospels (*Die Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, Leipzig, 1907), which, though fundamental to Church History, belongs rather to the technical field of New Testament studies than to those considered by this Society. The same may be said of Prof. James Orr's *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (New York, 1907), which is the ablest argument for the conservative position, not merely regarding the doctrine that gives the title to the work but toward the New Testament generally, that has recently been published in English. A thorough discussion of all available information bearing on the Neronian persecution is that of E. Theodor Klette, *Die Christenkatastrophe unter Nero* (Tübingen, 1907), in which the statements of Tacitus are criticised [13] in the light of allusions in Clement, Melito, Tertullian, and other Christian writers.

An American scholar, Prof. Edgar J. Goodspeed, of the University of Chicago, has given us a useful concordance of the Apostolic Fathers, under the title *Index Patristicus* (Leipzig, 1907). Gnosticism has been subjected to a careful examination by a competent Italian investigator, Prof.

E. Buonaiuti, *Lo Gnosticismo: Storia d'antiche lotte religiose* (Rome, 1907), who discredits the influence of Oriental religions in its origin, and believes that its importance in the development of doctrine has been exaggerated. A French student, P. Saintyves, under the title *Les Saints, successeurs des Dieux* (Paris, 1907), has issued a valuable amplification of the results already in part reached by Lucius in his important *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults*, of 1904. Saintyves finds the two main sources of saint worship in the pre-Christian reverence paid to heroes and demigods, and the honors accorded to the dead, especially to martyrs. The combination of the two tendencies, in his view resulted in the Christian worship of the saints. A significant investigation of Chrysostom's influence in history, which the year has brought forth, is that of Christian Baur, *Saint Jean Chrysostom et ses œuvres dans l'histoire littéraire* (Paris, 1907). Our own Prof. Warfield of Princeton has continued through the year his valuable studies of Augustine, in the *Princeton Theological Review*.

Turning now to the Middle Ages, the year has contributed a careful examination of the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, the work of P. Fournier, *Études sur les fausses Décrétales* (Louvain, 1907). Fournier agrees with Hinschius in dating the composition of these decretals between 847 and 852, but shows good reasons for regarding their orgin as in the region of Tours and not that of Rheims; and also for believing that Pope Nicholas I, the earliest pope to make use of them, was not acquainted with the collection as a whole, but simply had a few of these forgeries before him. Our own American scholar, Prof. David S. Schaff, has published during the year (New York, 1907) the first part of the fifth volume, continuing his father's well-known *History of the Christian Church*, from [14] 1049 to 1294. Prof. Schaff has succeeded with remarkable skill in reproducing the spirit and method of his father's familiar and useful work. Perhaps the point to attract most immediately the

reader of this volume is a vigorous defense of the traditional view of the influence of Peter the Hermit in the origin of the First Crusade, which had been so generally discredited since the labors of von Sybel. A French scholar, Louis Bréhier, in his *L'Église et l'Orient au Moyen Age: Les Croisades* (Paris, 1907), has published a good compendium of crusading history fully abreast of modern discussions but contributing very little that is new to the understanding of the movement or the age in which it took place. On the other hand, German patriotism has led A. Dammann in his *Der Sieg Heinrichs IV in Kanossa* (Braunschweig, 1907), into an attempt to show that Henry IV was not an humble suppliant before Hildebrand at Canossa but assertively and victoriously demanded the removal of the Pope's bann as king and prospective head of an army. A good study of the only Englishman who has ever occupied the papal throne is that of a young English scholar, J. D. Mackie, *Pope Adrian IV* (Oxford, 1907); and a German student, Anton Eitel, in his *Der Kirchenstaat unter Klemens V* (Berlin, 1907), has shown that this first of the Avignon popes, however lacking in some other qualities desirable in an occupant of his office, manifested a statesmanlike ability in his relations to Italy, for which previous historians had not given him credit.

The interest in Saint Francis and his times which is so markedly a feature of the present age has not resulted, during the past year, in works of prime importance. Father Paschal Robinson, in his short *Introduction to Franciscan Studies* (New York, 1907), has given an exceedingly useful little guide to the rapidly multiplying literature on this theme, and in his *Golden Sayings of the Blessed Brother Giles of Assisi* (Philadelphia, 1907) has made available in English the writings of an intimate companion of Francis, which illustrate the more spiritual aspects of the Franciscan movement. The Herbert Baxter Adams Prize for 1905, of our American Historical Association, was awarded to Dr. David S. Muzzey for his valuable study [15] of *The Spiritual Franciscans* (New

York, 1907), in which he has discussed their story from the death of Saint Francis to the times of Pope John XXII.

American scholarship has long and deservedly been proud of the work of Mr. Henry C. Lea, and the year has witnessed the completion, by the publication of the third and fourth volumes (New York, 1907), of his painstaking and extensive *History of the Inquisition of Spain*, which must long continue to be regarded as an authority of prime importance on this theme. Mr. Lea has also issued in revised form, during the past year, his well-known *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy* (New York, 1907).

The perennial interest in the Reformation has been illustrated as usual, during the past year, its most significant result being the completion of Principal Thomas M. Lindsay's *History of the Reformation* (Edinburgh and New York, 1906–7). Dr. Lindsay's work is at its best in its treatment of the Reformation in Germany, especially in its knowledge of the popular life and of the household type of piety in which he has shown that so much of the springs of the Lutheran movement are to be found. His second volume, treating of the Reformation outside of the land of its origin, is much more hasty in composition and much less satisfactory in proportionment and contains relatively little that is new. But the two volumes as a whole constitute the best history of the Reformation now available in English. Similar praise cannot be given to J. P. Whitney's *The Reformation* (London and New York, 1907) in W. H. Hutton's "Church Universal Series." The standpoint of the author is that of an Anglo-Catholic, and his treatment of his theme, from a scholarly point of view, does not compare with that of Dr. Lindsay. Dr. Preserved Smith, son of the well-known Old Testament scholar, in his *Luther's Table Talk: A Critical Study* (New York, 1907), has presented a valuable discussion of one of the important sources of our knowledge of the great Reformer; while August Lang of Halle, already distinguished for his significant studies regarding Calvin and Bucer, has

carefully investigated the relations of the Heidelberg Catechism, to antecedent compendiums of a similar [16] character which the Reformation produced in his *Der Heidelberger Katechismus und Vier Verwandte Katechismen* (Leipzig, 1907).

English Church History has been enriched by W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas through their *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt* (London, 1907). The first named author is the well-known reviser of Procter's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*. This volume makes accessible many of the rarer Puritan tracts and renders it possible to form a more accurate judgment as to the origin and early history of the Puritan movement than heretofore. Mr. Champlin Burrage, a young American scholar, who holds the Research Fellowship of Newton Theological Institution, has continued his investigations of the history and writings of Robert Browne, the father of Congregationalism, which have already resulted in the discovery of much fresh material and several treatises supposedly lost. In the Lambeth Library, he has found a tract of 1588 from Browne's pen, which he has published as *The Retraction of Robert Browne* (Oxford, 1907), and which reveals that vigorous controversialist in a surprisingly sane, mild, and reasonable frame of mind, and may be said practically to refute the contention of the late Rev. Dr. Dexter, based on much less knowledge of the sources, that Browne was mentally unbalanced, in consequence of his sufferings, when he made his peace with the Church of England. The year has witnessed the completion of the English scholar, R. W. Dale's elaborate *History of English Congregationalism* by his son, A. W. W. Dale (*A History of English Congregationalism*, London, 1907), offering, in one thick volume, a full and scholarly discussion of the history of this religious body in the land of its origin from its beginnings to the present. Of less significance, but still a valuable compendium, covering a most eventful period, is Alfred Plummer's *English Church*

History from the Death of Charles I to the Death of William III (Edinburgh, 1907).

Mention should be made of a new German series of much promise, under the editorship of H. Hoffmann and L. Zscharnack, entitled *Studien zur Geschichte des neueren Protestantismus* [17] (Giessen, 1907), in which a number of valuable discussions have been issued during the year. Another discussion of modern Church History is that of an eminent American scholar, Dr. Frank H. Foster, entitled, *A Genetic History of the New England Theology* (Chicago, 1907). In acquaintance with the leaders of New England thought and their relations one to another, and in keenness of critical estimate as to their relative value and the significance of their services to Christian theology, this work of Dr. Foster's is easily the superior of anything that has yet been written upon this theme. Less fresh in its contributions and rather to be considered as a compendious sketch, is T. Hughes's *History of the Society of Jesus in North America* (London, 1907). Mr. George H. Putnam, the well-known publisher, has completed his *Censorship of the Church of Rome and its Influence upon the Production and Distribution of Literature*—the second volume, treating especially of the last century, having been published this year (New York, 1907). Mr. Putnam's work is very largely a compilation, but it has made accessible in English much that has heretofore not been available to the reader whose knowledge was confined to that language. Prof. Henry C. Sheldon of Boston University has published a useful history of *Unbelief in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1907); and an English rector, Arthur Galton, Vicar of Edenham, has issued a particularly timely survey of *Church and State in France, 1300 to 1907* (London, 1907), of special service through its discussions of the recent relations of Church and State in that land.

Our consideration of this list of publications, which in spite of a length that I fear has already wearied you, cannot be regarded as exhaustive but simply as giving the more sig-

nificant, leaves us no cause to be ashamed of American scholarship. The discussions of the past year from the pens of students on this side of the Atlantic, have covered a wide range of topics in the great field of Church History, and are such as [18] to hold an honorable place in the contributions which have been made during the period to the studies which this Society regards as of prime importance. Certainly, we have abundant reason to feel that Church History is commanding, year by year, a wider attention and a more profound study from American scholars. In examining their work for the year, however, we must have been impressed with the fact that there is, as yet, little evidence of coöperation in effort on this side of the Atlantic. Individual studies of great importance and thoroughness, like those of Mr. Lea, President Hartranft, and Dr. Foster, to mention no others, have been begun or brought to successful completion and are an honor to American learning, but there is as yet little united effort on the part of American scholars, and their discussions are controlled by no systematic attempts, such as we see in France and Germany, to examine by collective endeavor distinct fields of history of which they may take, if not exclusive, yet prime possession. It should be the object of a Society like this to promote such acquaintance and coöperation between American scholars and thus to aid the study of Church History at the point at which it now seems most deficient in this country. One field in particular should be our especial province; it is that of American Church History. The services of this Society, initiated by the late Prof. Schaff, and resulting in the "American Church History Series," have given us the inestimable benefit of careful denominational histories. But we need to go a step further. A thorough examination of the history of Christianity as a whole in the United States, such as was foreshadowed, though necessarily in a very limited way, by our late colleague, Rev. Dr. Leonard W. Bacon, in the thirteenth volume of the Series just mentioned, is a desideratum. It

might be well undertaken under the auspices of this Society; which would thus garner and present in a form that would command foreign recognition, as well as serve American scholars, the significant contributions of American Christianity as a whole to the history of the Christian church. The religious life on this side the Atlantic has, indeed, its sources beyond the sea, and its history reflects much of the discussions which have run their course on European [19] soil; but it has, nevertheless, its own flavor, and has made conspicuous contributions to Christianity as a whole, and these deserve an adequate treatment, such as they cannot have under the limitations of denominational discussion, but such as easily might be given to them in a general history of American Christianity. Such a work might fittingly be inaugurated under the auspices of the American Society of Church History.

The Tendency Towards Centralization of Authority Among American Congregationalists and Baptists

By

Henry Kalloch Rowe

THE TENDENCY TOWARDS CENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY AMONG AMERICAN CONGREGATIONALISTS AND BAPTISTS

By Henry Kalloch Rowe, Assistant Professor of Church History, Newton Theological Institution

(*Read Dec. 27, 1907*)

THE present tendency toward centralization among Congregationalists and Baptists is one of the prominent phenomena of contemporary American Church History. It deserves recognition as a sign of the times; it is for historians to find its place in the continuity of historical development. The records of its latest phases are hardly yet in print; its beginnings are several centuries old.

We are familiar with the story of the beginnings of Separatism. We know that several congregations of English refugees established themselves in the Netherlands, and that from these came the English Congregationalists and Baptists and the Pilgrims of Plymouth in America. Both Congregationalists and Baptists very properly trace their line of descent from Robert Browne. The fundamentals of Congregational polity are expressed in his treatises of 1582 in which he maintained: (1) The right of the individual to decide for himself his church affiliation; (2) the sufficiency of the local church to elect and ordain its officers and to control its own affairs; (3) the principle of fellowship between churches, and the exchange of counsel, but without

any central authority to exercise discipline, or dictate in matters of faith and practice.

In studying the history of American independency we find two periods when interest in polity was intense. One of [26] these was during the first century of New England Congregationalism; the other is that of recent years. We need not seek far for the causes of the first. The problem of polity was of the essence of Separatism. The independent congregations in separating from Episcopacy were absorbed of necessity in the problem of how to organize and conduct themselves after the New Testament model and in a way that would conserve their own Separatist interests. This could not be done in a day, especially as they were not fully agreed.

They began with Brownism, but Brownism was modified by Barrowism, which gave greater power to the elders of the churches.[1] New England Congregationalism was largely influenced by Barrowism, and we know how strong was the influence of the ministers in the Bay Colony. The reasons for this are simple. There was first of all the desire to prevent dissension—a danger which the Separatists in Holland and in England showed to be a very real one. Then there were as contributing causes the heritage of Episcopal authority whose influence could not cease to operate at once, the idea of leadership like that of prophet and priest in the Old Testament, and the fact that the New England divines of the first generation were for the most part able and well-educated men. The early writings of these men show clearly the influence of Barrowism in the ordering of the *New England Way.*[2]

American Congregationalists started, therefore, with a modified Congregationalism. Baptists in England differed somewhat in doctrine and polity. We may disregard, how-

[1] *Vide* Confession of 1589 of the London-Amsterdam Church in Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, pp. 34–37.

[2] Richard Mather, *Order of the Gospels* (1700), p. 73.

ever, the General Baptists, who ceased after a time to be of importance, and pause only to note that the Particular Baptists, like the Congregationalists, believed in the independence of the local church and practised it both in England and in this country. Their relative weakness in this country during the seventeenth century makes it possible for us to confine ourselves to the story of the New England Congregationalists.

The history of New England Congregationalism in the first [27] century, when questions of policy are of dominant interest, expresses itself most clearly in two declarations of principles—the Cambridge Platform of 1648 and the Saybrook Platform of 1708. Separatism in the Bay Colony was a good deal of an experiment. The Puritans had not separated from the Establishment until they came to America, and they were feeling their way towards a settled polity. There was much dissension and agitation in the early years of the colony, and as the first half of the seventeenth century drew towards its close it appeared desirable that the constitution of Congregationalism should be more definitely defined. Church and State were so nearly synonymous that the General Court took the initiative and called a synod. It was distinctly understood that this synod had no power to legislate for the churches. Hooker expressed this clearly and concisely when he said: "Synods have allowance to counsel and admonish other churches, as the case may require. And if they grow obstinate in error or sinful miscarriages, they should renounce the right hand of fellowship with them. But they have no power to excommunicate, nor to impose their canons or conclusions upon them."[1] The leaders of New England Congregationalism could express their opinions, and their influence gave those opinions the force of law, especially as they were endorsed by the General Court. The Cambridge Platform announced its adherence to Barrowism by declaring that Congregational-

[1] Hooker, Preface to *Survey of the Sum of Church Discipline.*

ism was divinely ordained; that the local church was independent, choosing and ordaining its own officers, and placing the management of its affairs in their hands; that a council might be called to advise locally and a synod to make declaration of principles, but that these had no power of government. Over all was the ægis of the magistrates.[1]

As the seventeenth century passed into its fourth quarter it was evident that the ministry of Massachusetts was losing something of its prestige. The charter of 1691 was to destroy the absolutism of the Congregationalist church. The ministers protested against this tendency, and at the Reforming Synod [28] of 1679–1680 favored an increase of power for ministers and synods. The lukewarmness of Court and people in Massachusetts prevented such a step in the direction of Presbyterianism; but in Connecticut there was a strong movement in this direction, culminating in the Saybrook Synod of 1708. This meeting marks a parting of the ways between Massachusetts and Connecticut. The "Fifteen Articles," incorporated into the Saybrook Platform and adopted by the Connecticut Legislature and the various churches, made the churches of that colony practically Presbyterian, and led to sympathy and eventually to a Plan of Union in missionary effort between Connecticut Congregationalists and Presbyterians of the Middle States that had much to do with retarding the growth of pure Congregationalism in New York and the Middle West.[2]

The Saybrook Platform provided as before for the government of the local church by the local elders, but greater emphasis was put upon the advice of neighboring elders in difficult cases of discipline. Semi-annual ministerial associations were to be held to discuss matters of mutual interest, and especially to safeguard the church from scandal and heresy, and to examine the candidates for the ministry.

[1] Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, pp. 210–237.

[2] *Cf. ibid.*, pp. 515–516; Bacon, *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of Connecticut*, pp. 68–70.

Delegates from these associations were to meet in an annual General Association. To prevent local conflicting councils unions of churches known as consociations were formed with considerable power, a consociation generally corresponding to a county.[1] Interpretations of the document varied,[2] but the consociation became an established and efficient institution until supplanted by the conference in most cases.

The history of Massachusetts Congregationalism thus left to itself in the eighteenth century is not inspiring. The interest in polity declined, and along with it went a general decline in religious interest. People were absorbed in material gain and in colonial politics. The Great Awakening furnished an antidote to this temporarily at the middle of the century, [29] but the revival was followed by a period still more barren spiritually. After Jonathan Edwards and his contemporaries what religious interest there was manifested itself doctrinally until after the Unitarian secession in the nineteenth century, save for a few revivals in the years following 1800.

Meantime other people had been settling in the colonies of the Atlantic seaboard, bringing with them diversities in religious practice. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, Baptists had found their way into various localities in considerable numbers. Bringing with them the Congregational polity they made their contribution to its development in the eighteenth century, while New England Congregationalism stagnated. We may turn to the Baptist history with profit at this point.

The particular institutions of this period that deserve notice are the local council and the association, and their mutual relations. The local council was an expedient in use among the New England Congregationalists in the seventeenth century, and the association was known in England

[1] For the text of the articles *vide* Walker, *Creeds*, pp. 502–506.

[2] *Cf. ibid.*, pp. 509–514.

from about the middle of the seventeenth century, but these have been the means among American churches of developing an ecclesiastical polity that seems to be metamorphosing itself into a form of Presbyterianism.

Baptist churches were so few in the seventeenth century that associational meetings were impracticable. In 1707 the parent organization was effected in the formation of the Philadelphia Association, growing out of local quarterly and yearly meetings. The purpose of the organization was stated to be the settlement of grievances and troublesome cases of discipline, and the promotion of general interests.[1] In 1729 there was a flourishing association among the Six-Principle Baptists of southeastern New England.[2] In 1751 the Charleston Association was formed in the South, and the Warren Association, the first of the regular Baptists in New England, was organized in 1767.

The significance of these associations is not to be over-[30] looked. They bear witness to a recognition on the part of American Baptists to the principle of fellowship; and while the minutes of the associations show a careful preservation of the rights of the local churches, they also testify to a consciousness of their mutual interdependence. In a time when the denomination was in its infancy in this country, the associations took upon themselves such matters as the encouragement of education by the founding of higher institutions of learning, the evangelization of outlying sections of country, and agitation for full religious liberty both North and South.[3] The fact that the action of these associations was guided by able leaders of the denomination added greatly to their prestige. It became the custom for churches to refer questions of doctrine and polity to the associations, and their replies, while not

[1] Minutes of the Philadelphia Association, 1707–1807.

[2] John Comer's Diary, pp. 66 n., 70–71 n.

[3] Newman, *History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, pp. 275–278, 352 f., 367 f.

recognized as authoritative decrees, received general acceptance. Oftentimes the association manifested reluctance to express its opinion, fearing to increase the functions of the association and so to establish a court of appeal in the denomination.[1]

During this same period, the local council was in operation for advice in matters of local discipline. The normal position of the association and of the council in Baptist churches is made plain in the records of Maine Baptist associations where it is stated: "In associating ourselves we disclaim all pretensions to the least control on the independence of particular churches; our main design is to establish a medium of communication relative to the general state of religion—recommend such measures—give such advice—and render such assistance as shall be thought most conducive to the advancement, peace, and enlargement of the Redeemer's kingdom in the world."[2] And again: "An association of churches has no power to abrogate the censures of an individual church; and, therefore, all questions and difficulties between churches and excluded members, are to be decided by councils of ministers and [31] churches appointed by the consent of parties."[3] All through the eighteenth century we find a general recognition of the council as a temporary association of local churches for a special purpose, and the functions of such a council were not often assumed by an association, mainly because of voluntary self-limitation of the associations.[4]

The nineteenth century opened a wider vista to the churches of America. A new consciousness of the responsibility that lay upon Christians to be of service to their fellow-men led to the formation of missionary societies and humanitarian associations, that added greatly to the multi-

[1] Millet, *Maine Baptists*, pp. 250–253.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 103. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

[4] For the beginnings of Baptist Councils *vide* Allison, *Baptist Councils in America*, (1906), pp. 27–41.

plicity of church organizations. Educational interests came into being with the increased recognition of the need of practical Christian training, and publication societies for the diffusion of Christian information were formed.[1] It was inevitable that in this process there should arise rivalries and differences of opinion; that there should be a waste of resources through duplication of effort; and that through lack of correlation and coöperation there should become evident after a while a failure to meet the rapidly growing demands of that wonderful century of expansion. Conscious of these things and feeling the spirit of the present age which is satisfied with nothing less than a high degree of economy and efficiency, the Christian leaders of the Congregational and Baptist denominations have felt a revived interest in problems of church polity, and recent years have seen various attempts looking towards more efficient organization.

We may trace this tendency in the history of both of these independent bodies in the last twenty-five years. The Congregationalists were the first to begin the movement. They had organized their first local conference of churches in Massachusetts in 1821, and their first State association in Maine in 1826; associations of ministers had been common from the early years of New England settlement. In 1852 and again in 1865, general assemblies of Congregationalists from [32] all over the country met and considered their mutual interests. All these culminated in 1871 in the organization of the National Council, whose purpose as expressed in the preamble of the constitution is "to express and foster their substantial unity in doctrine, polity, and work; and to consult upon the common interests of all churches, their duties in the work of evangelization, the united development of their resources, and their relations to all parts of the kingdom of Christ."[2] This Council consists of delegates, lay and ministerial, divided

[1] *Cf.*, *e. g.* Newman, *A Century of Baptist Achievement*, pp. 174–279, 322–254.
[2] Walker, *Creeds*, p. 572.

"as nearly equally as is practicable," representing local and State associations, and various organizations of the Congregational body. The constitution expressly states that the right of government continues to reside in the local church, but that the principle of fellowship must be recognized in inter-church relations. The National Council has held thirteen sessions, and a fair estimate of its usefulness may be quoted from a Congregational writer: "It has been a most valuable means of expressing and promoting fellowship in the widely scattered churches of our order. It has discussed questions vital to our polity. It has given advice, sometimes wise and sometimes not so well considered, which has been followed or not as it has commended itself to the churches. It has not even been obliged to be always consistent with itself or the precedents which it has created. It has helped greatly in the solution of important questions, and shown that union is possible without uniformity. It will, in the future, be increasingly the rallying place and unifying power of the denomination."[1]

The National Council has always disclaimed any intention to infringe upon the rights of individual churches, but the logic of events has been leading in the direction of a greater centralization of authority. From its inception the Council has exerted its influence in favor of Christian unity, and the last few years have witnessed an attempt to bring together the Congregationalists with two other ecclesiastical bodies in an organic union. Such an undertaking involved an amendment of Congregational polity, and at the triennial meeting at Des Moines [33] in 1904 a Committee of Nine was appointed "to do what may be done on its own initiative, and in conference and coöperation with local and State bodies for the better adjustment of our Congregational order to existing conditions."[2] Besides the matter of adjust-

[1] Boynton, *The Congregational Way*, p. 136.

[2] National Council of Congregational Churches of the United States, *Addresses, Reports, . . . etc., of the thirteenth triennial session, Cleveland, Ohio, October 8-17, 1907*, Boston, 1907, pp. 340-347: Report of the Committee on Polity.

ment with the bodies proposing union, this Committee of Nine was to prepare a course of study for ministers as a minimum requirement for ordination, and to devise means for the improvement of the relations between pastors and churches. The committee proceeded to investigate conditions and the attitude of the churches and associations. The whole question of Congregational polity was opened up and discussed, and while many expressed themselves as opposed to anything that threatened the complete independence of the local church, there has been growing a conviction that there should be a strengthening of the Congregational organization for greater efficiency. The report of the Committee on Polity makes plain the current of opinion. Several State associations have reorganized along the lines of greater simplicity and unity, realizing that "the waning use of ecclesiastical council and its inadequacy to meet the demands and needs of the churches, the languishing condition of many feeble fields, the lack of supervisory care, and the complex character of our agencies and organizations call for the initiation of a more truly representative and Congregational system of administration." The committee in its report recently submitted goes on to say:

> Entirely aside from and independent of the large and vital interests involved in the proposed Tri-denominational Union, and resultant of what our inquiries have elicited from the large body of our churches, your committee are of one judgment that our Congregational churches may safely and consistently move along the lines of representative order without in the least imperiling either of their fundamental principles of autonomy or fellowship; and we unite in the conviction that our churches should address themselves with earnest and intelligent purpose to such readjustment of their order as shall provide for a representative administration of all of our interests.[1]

[1] National Council of Congregational Churches of the United States, *Addresses, Reports, . . . etc., of the thirteenth triennial session, Cleveland, Ohio, October 8–17, 1907*, Boston, 1907, pp. 340–347: Report of the Committee on Polity.

[34] The Committee on Polity reported at the meeting of the National Council at Cleveland in October, 1907, recommending a uniform designation of local assemblies as "associations" and of State bodies as "conferences," the vesting of ministerial standing in the local associations, a larger recognition to local associations as a conciliar unit with continued direct representation in the National Council, and, most important of all, the two following provisions:

That the state organizations become legally incorporated bodies; and that under a general superintendent and such boards as they may create, and acting in coöperation with committees of local associations and churches, they provide for and direct the extension of church work, the planting of churches, the mutual oversight and care of all self-sustaining as well as missionary churches, and other missionary and church activities to the end that closer union may insure greater efficiency without curtailing local independence. That the administration of the benevolent interests of our churches be directed by the representatives of the churches in national organization and that this Council appoint a commission of fifteen, including a representative from each of our benevolent societies, who shall report at its next regular meeting such an adjustment of these societies to the bodies of the churches represented in this Council as shall secure such direction, care being taken to safeguard existing constitutional provision of those societies and the present membership of their boards of control, but also to lodge, hereafter, the creation and continuance of these administrative boards in the suffrage of the representatives of the churches.

This last provision is proof of the fact that there is a rapid tendency towards centralization of authority when we compare it with the constitution of the National Council, which declares in its preamble that the "National Council shall never exercise legislative or judicial authority, nor consent to act as a council of reference."[1] The report of the committee was adopted.

Along the same path but more slowly have moved the

[1] Walker, *Creeds*, p. 573.

Baptists. Having made successful trial of district associations and [35] state conventions, Baptists north and south united in a General Convention for missionary purposes in 1814. This convention undertook to carry on foreign and home missions, education, and journalism, but with unequal success; after a few years it confined itself to foreign missions, and other societies were organized as needed. In 1845 Baptists north and south divided over the question of slavery, and the Southern Baptist Convention was organized on the plan of the original "Triennial Convention." Boards of Home and Foreign Missions were constituted as committees of the convention. Membership in the Southern Convention includes those who have contributed a certain sum to its funds, and delegates from "District Associations that coöperate with the convention." Membership in the northern societies is on the same basis of contribution to the funds of the societies.

With this system of loose voluntary organization for benevolent purposes, of State conventions and district associations, supplemented temporarily by local councils when necessary, the Baptist churches of America have got along, cherishing jealously the autonomy of the local church. In one respect the Baptists had improved upon the polity of the Congregationalists—in the adjustment of the local council to the association and the improvement of its efficiency. While the Congregational tendency has been away from the council to the association in such matters as ordination and the approval of ministerial standing, Baptist practice has been in the direction of emphasizing more the function of the council while its relation to the association was carefully defined.[1]

Two attempts were made by the Philadelphia Association between 1837 and 1845 to secure the participation of a committee of the Association in each session of a local council, but the attempt failed. Since 1896 several associa-

[1] Allison, *Baptist Councils in America*, p. 84.

tions have appointed advisory committees for consultation by churches or for the examination of ministerial candidates before the calling of a council; and while there are practical objections to this plan, it has worked well thus far. The most significant step has been [36] the adoption of the plan of a Permanent Council. This plan was initiated by the Southern New York Baptist Association in October, 1895, after the report of a committee appointed two years before. It provided for a permanent council, consisting of every pastor and one delegate from each church in the association, to meet regularly for the consideration of such matters as are usually brought before local councils, to take the initiative when necessary in matters pertaining to the common good, to act for the association during the interval between the meetings of the association, and to report to the association regularly.[1] Such a Permanent Council was vigorously opposed in the session of the Baptist Congress a month later[2]; but the organization was perfected with some changes, and proved a model for similar councils in other places.

With the opening of the twentieth century there was an increasing sentiment among Baptists that something should be done to coördinate the various benevolent enterprises of the denomination, to increase the unity and efficiency of the churches, and to reflect the Baptist consciousness of the denomination as a whole on the great questions of the day. This sentiment found expression locally in ministerial gatherings and at the anniversary meetings of the missionary societies. Committees were appointed and the matter was agitated with little definite result for a time, except that a committee of reference was created designed to be permanent, for the better coördination of the missionary societies. Meantime, in 1905 the Northern anniversaries and the annual meeting of the Southern Convention occurred simultaneously at St. Louis and the opportunity was improved to organize a

[1] Allison, *Baptist Councils in America*, pp. 97–98.

[2] *Report of the Baptist Congress*, 1895, p. 65.

General Convention of American Baptists "to promote closer fellowship among American Baptists, their increased efficiency, and spirituality, and the evangelistic spirit in our churches; to consider subjects having a bearing upon the missionary, educational, and philanthropic enterprises of the denomination and upon the moral and spiritual welfare of society." The organization was composed [37] of representatives of local churches, district associations, and State conventions all over the country.

This achievement was hailed with satisfaction as marking a distinct step towards the reunion of northern and southern Baptists, but the organization promised no great effectiveness, and agitation continued for the creation of a general organization of northern Baptists for the purposes already enumerated. The initiative was taken by the Chicago Association; this was supported by officials of the missionary societies; and a provisional organization was effected at the anniversary meetings in Washington, May 17, 1907, under the name of the "Northern Baptist Convention." Resolutions were offered declaring adherence to the principle of the independence of the local church, the advisory and representative nature of the district and State associations, but at the same time affirming the general conviction that a general body was needed to minister to the common interests of the denomination. A constitution and by-laws were adopted to be ratified a year later, after the churches and associations generally had acted upon the matter.[1] The completion of such organization will give to the Baptists of the United States two great conventions, the Northern and the Southern, based on State and district associations, and on the local church as the unit and foundation of the whole, and with a General Convention of all as the apex of the pyramid.

Briefly summarized the story of the evolution of Congregationalism as a church polity is from the simple to the complex, and from the local to the national and even inter-

[1] *Cf. The Standard* (Chicago), May 25, 1907.

national organization. Based on the principle of the self-government of the local church with no definite relation to other churches except as occasion demanded a local council or a synod, the Congregational and Baptist denominations have come to include widely diverging agencies closely related in organization, and becoming continually more co-operative, all finding a common head in a general council or convention. The outstanding features of present-day Congregationalism may be said to include:

[38] (1) The local church, conserving its own interests through its own membership, but acknowledging and practising the principles of fellowship and coöperation.

(2) The district association, considering matters of mutual interest, and in the case of the Congregational body having to a large extent the oversight of ministerial standing and ordination, which in the Baptist body is relegated to a temporary or permanent council.

(3) The State conference or convention, organized especially for a missionary purpose, but serving also to cement more firmly the common interests of the churches.

(4) The Congregational National Council, and the Baptist Northern and Southern Conventions culminating in the General Convention of the United States, organizations composed of representatives of churches and associations with a partially defined oversight of the benevolent activities of the denomination, and able to express, though without the force of authority, the denominational consciousness.

Congregationalism has many points in common with American civic interests. It has learned to combine flexibility with permanency, and is striving to adjust local independence to national efficiency. Could the three bodies seeking union under the leadership of the Congregationalists combine with the three seeking similar union under the leadership of the Baptists—nearly all having a recognized Congregational polity, we should have the spectacle of nearly seven million evangelical Christians that in the

spirit and form of their organizations most nearly resemble the national government under which we live. The law of continuity of development seems to point in that direction.

We are in the midst of the making of history. Independency has proved its worth in the course of the last three hundred years, but there is a general conviction that the direct democracy of the churches should be supplanted by a more effective representative system. The trend of opinion is very manifest in the history of the last five years in both of the bodies under consideration. There is no probability that the fundamental principles of Congregationalism will be sacrificed, [39] but there will come modifications of the system. The whole movement is but an added exemplification from contemporary history that time and environment are certain to modify the type, that changes of structure must conform to changes of function in the organism, and that the Christian church, if it would maintain life and efficiency, must adapt itself always and everywhere to the demands of the age.

Recent Researches in Holland and the Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York

By

Edward Tanjore Corwin

RECENT RESEARCHES IN HOLLAND AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL RECORDS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

By Edward Tanjore Corwin, North Branch, New Jersey

(*Read Dec. 28, 1906*)

I HAVE been requested by our honored secretary to prepare a paper on "Recent Researches in Holland and the Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York." This request has been made, no doubt, because volumes five and six of these ecclesiastical records have just been issued, thus completing the work. These six volumes represent the results of the labor of many years. Permit first a brief preliminary statement of the origin of the enterprise.

The Hon. J. Romeyn Brodhead was commissioned by the State of New York in 1841 to procure transcripts of documents in the archives of Europe, to illustrate the history of the State. He was engaged about three years in this work, and as a result of his labors, the State published the ten folio volumes styled *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, 1853–58. The State had printed a few years previously, from material already in their archives, the *Documentary History of New York*. These two great works constituted a perfect mine of contemporary material for students not only of the civil history but also of the ecclesiastical history of the State;

for hundreds of documents and thousands of allusions occur therein to ecclesiastical matters. These volumes were also thoroughly indexed.

But as Mr. Brodhead started on his mission, Rev. Dr. Thomas DeWitt of the Collegiate Church of New York, requested him to seek access while in Europe also to the ecclesiastical [44] archives of Holland, and ascertain whether there was not material therein which would throw additional light on the early church history of New York. As this was in harmony with his main enterprise he readily consented. His letter making application to the Classis of Amsterdam for permission to search their archives was found by the writer, as well as several letters from Dr. DeWitt bearing on the same subject. Mr. Brodhead's letter begins as follows:

> The undersigned, commissioned by the State of New York as agent, for the purpose of procuring in Holland, England and France, documents illustrating the early history of the State, begs leave to submit a few observations to your Rev. Body.

He then briefly refers to the early planting of the church in New York, and the great importance of the material which must be in their archives for the elucidation of the social and religious history of the State. He adds:

> The Revolutionary War . . . was no doubt the cause why so many of our precious records and memorials . . . deposited with the different churches and ministers, are not now to be found. Great exertions have been made, and are now making, to recover whatever is possible of these papers. . . . The documents and papers in the archives of the Classis (of Amsterdam) relating to the churches of New Netherland . . . are of the highest importance to the historian in New York. . . . They would furnish a rich treasure from whence to draw materials for the contemplated history. . . .

His request was cheerfully granted. Mr. Brodhead, how-

ever, could not make these researches himself, but he employed certain parties in Amsterdam to make the searches and transcripts for him. But they, being strangers to American names, geographical and individual, were not the best adapted for such a task and, as the results now show, did not make their work exhaustive.

For the archives of the Classis of Amsterdam are very rich in material. They now consist of two distinct parts, the Old Archives, 1578–1816, on the second floor of the consistory [45] building of the Nieuw Kerk, and the New Archives, on the ground floor of the same building, from 1816 to the present time. With the great changes introduced in Holland by the Napoleonic wars, not only was the civil administration completely changed, but even the polity of the Church was greatly modified at the demand of the King, and meekly accepted by the Church in order to secure again financial support from the State which had been discontinued for a score of years. With these changes also, the old ecclesiastical records, representing the Church during the period of the Dutch Republic, were considered closed, and a new series of record books, under the new régime, begun.

We have to do only with the old archives, but these are somewhat complex in character, for they consist of several distinct sets of books and portfolios, as follows:

1. The Minutes of the Classis proper, running from 1578 to 1816, a period of 238 years. These are contained in eighteen large folio volumes.

2. But the Classis had also a Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, styled *Deputati ad Res Exteras*. This name was sometimes varied to *Deputati ad Res Indicas*, or *Deputati ad Res Maritimas*. This was what we would call an Executive Committee. Their duties were to carry out the orders of the Classis respecting all colonial ecclesiastical affairs. They conducted all the correspondence, which was carried on, first and last, with the churches in about twenty different colonies scattered all over the world. This committee

reported to the Classis on the letters received, generally giving abstracts of the same. They also formulated replies to be sent to these churches, which were submitted to the action of Classis, and approved, or amended, as thought to be necessary. This committee also kept minutes of its own and these, as now found, run from 1639 to 1804, a period of 166 years, and are contained in six large folio volumes, closely written. There is also evidence of one or two preliminary volumes having been lost.

3. There are also seven large folio volumes in which were recorded copies of all letters sent by this Executive Committee [46] to those various foreign churches. This set of volumes runs from 1648 to 1804, a period of 157 years, with evidences also of the loss of one or two preliminary volumes.

4. And finally there yet remain twenty-five extensible portfolios, packed with letters which are on file, from all those foreign fields with which the Classis was in correspondence. Most of this correspondence is in the Netherlands language, yet not a little is in the German tongue with the distinctively German churches of Pennsylvania, while parts are in Latin, French, or Portuguese.

5. Then also the Classis of Amsterdam has in her archives a complete set of the Minutes of the Provincial Synod of North Holland, extending from 1572 to 1816, all in manuscript volumes; not to speak of other odd volumes of the seven other Provincial Synods, and an almost endless number of bundles of papers.

Such is the present arrangement of the old archives of the Classis of Amsterdam. But this arrangement represents a new classification, made about 1880, of the foreign letters on file. These were previously stowed away in bundles, and not assorted in portfolios as at present. This is evident, not only from statements elsewhere made, but also from the fact that hundreds of American letters were missed by those who made the researches for Mr. Brodhead in 1841; not to speak of their failure to examine exhaustively the minutes

of the Classis, of the *Deputati ad Res Exteras*, and of the Synod of North Holland, for additional facts relating to our American church history.

Indeed, to secure all the items relating to America from these archives, and that, too, by strangers to American localities and individuals, was no easy task. Such would certainly not be the most competent to recognize every desirable item; neither would they have felt the necessity then, as we do to-day, of searching systematically and exhaustively all those different sets of volumes, in order to secure and collate all facts to be found in them relating to our American churches. Nevertheless they deserve much praise for the material which [47] they did bring to light, and which has suggested and stimulated further investigations.

We can judge of the extent of their researches by the actual results. They evidently limited their investigations to the correspondence. They did not examine at all the elaborate Minutes of the Classis, although they seem to have begun to examine the Minutes of the *Deputati ad Res Exteras*, but did not proceed very far therein. They did not examine the Minutes of the Synod of North Holland at all. They seem to have thought that the transcription of the letters of the Classis to the American churches, found in those seven volumes of correspondence before alluded to, would give all the necessary or desirable facts; in conjunction with the loan, to the General Synod of the Dutch Church in America, of the original letters sent from America to the Classis. Now those transcriptions of the letters from the Classis to America, so far as then recognized by those Dutch searchers, with those loaned letters which had been sent from America to the Classis, so far as then found, constituted the bulk of the material which Mr. Brodhead sent to America, from these ecclesiastical archives, in advance of his own return.

The said documents were received, in good order, in the latter part of September, 1842. The exact number then received is not now known. There does not appear to have

been any calendar of them then made, so far as we know. The transcripts of the letters of the Classis to America had been made on sheets of uniform size. These were elegantly bound in morocco, in one large volume, making about 900 pages. The original letters from America, which were loaned to the General Synod, were to be safely returned in four years. These were not then in portfolios, as similar letters are found at present, but as sent over, were in seven bundles, two of which were letters from the German churches of Pennsylvania. At least as many more bundles were then missed, as is now evident from later researches. Says Dr. DeWitt in his report to General Synod concerning these letters received in 1842:

> They are particularly useful as to the earlier period of our Church, concerning which there is an almost entire dearth of [48] information among ourselves. . . . It is desirable that these original letters should be in the permanent possession of the General Synod, if the Classis of Amsterdam can be induced to part with them. If they cannot be retained, the most important of them should be copied before their return to Holland.

It is greatly to be regretted that all of these original letters from America were not at once copied in a volume or volumes and with the letters from the Classis to America, translated, and made accessible to the Church at large. Four years later (1846) Dr. DeWitt visited Holland, and induced the Classis of Amsterdam to transfer the ownership of those original letters to the American General Synod; but for this act the Classis was afterward censured by the civil authorities.

Now all this material remained in the private hands of Dr. DeWitt and Mr. Brodhead for more than a quarter of a century. None, indeed, had a better right to it. Meantime it was utilized to a considerable extent by various parties in the preparation of historical works, addresses, and articles in periodical literature and the religious press.

1. Mr. Brodhead availed himself of this material in the

preparation of his invaluable history of the State of New York. From it he frequently quotes. But he lived to issue only two elaborate volumes, bringing the work down to 1691. A third volume was almost ready for the press, as he tells us in the preface of his second volume, which would have brought the work down to 1705. This volume would have covered, in many respects, the most important period in the history of the colonial Church, the period of the Ministry Act, which has been generally misunderstood, and of the two earliest church charters, that of the Collegiate Church, 1696, and of Trinity Church, 1697, about which there is very much yet to be said; but he did not live to revise, finally, this third volume. Cannot the manuscript yet be recovered and edited? It would be invaluable. Mr. Brodhead died in 1877.

2. Dr. DeWitt was requested by the General Synod to utilize this material in an elaborate history of the Church down to the Revolution. But he had arduous pastoral and pulpit duties to perform, and in the midst of his activities he experienced [49] a couple of slight paralytic strokes which partially disabled him, and ultimately prevented him from carrying out this design. He had, however, in the meantime translated a number of these letters. Some of these were printed in the *Documentary History* of the State, others in the *Proceedings* of the New York Historical Society, and still others in the periodicals of the day. He also wrote a number of articles on historical topics, founded on these letters, such as those in Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit.* From them he also constructed the first approximately complete list of the ministers of the Dutch Church in America, down to the year 1800. This list was printed in the Appendix to his valuable *Historical Discourse* of 1856.

3. The New York Historical Society also printed some of this material or articles founded on it in the volumes of their *Proceedings*, besides those prepared by Dr. DeWitt. Mr. Brodhead furnished some of these.

4. Hon. Henry C. Murphy also utilized some of this material in his unique volume—*The Anthology of New Netherlands*, 1865. It was he who first sent to this country in 1858, being then the American Minister to Holland, a translation of the elaborate letter of Rev. Jonas Michaelius, of 1628, the first minister of the Dutch Church in America. He also found while there a volume containing the poems of Domine Selyns, in Dutch and Latin, specimens of which are given in his *Anthology*.

5. And, finally, Rev. Henry Harbaugh used that part of this material, the two bundles of German letters before alluded to, which related to the German ministers and churches of Pennsylvania, in the preparation of his two very interesting volumes—*The Fathers of the Reformed Church*, 1857, and his *Life of Rev. Michael Schlatter*, who was sent over as Superintendent of the German churches.

Meantime, as Dr. DeWitt and Mr. Brodhead were advancing in age, and interest in historical studies was increasing, considerable desire began to be manifested that all this valuable material should be placed under the official care of the General Synod, and be made available to all historical inquirers. [50] Accordingly in 1866 resolutions were introduced in General Synod to appoint a committee to suggest plans for the collection and preservation of documents relating to the past history of the Church; but it was not until 1870 that these documents were actually passed into the hands of the Stated Clerk of the General Synod. Dr. DeWitt and Mr. Brodhead were also now thanked for the care which they had so long taken of these documents.

In 1875, with the building of the Gardner A. Sage Library at New Brunswick, N. J., the Amsterdam Correspondence was deposited in a fire-proof room therein. A committee on the choice of books for this library now called the attention of the Synod to the importance of having all this material translated, together with certain Dutch historical pamphlets of the eighteenth century bearing on the history of the

Church. This was accordingly directed, and the translations were made chiefly at the expense of the Library Fund.

A Calendar was now made in chronological order, of all this material, comprising, as it did, some 2000 pages. Other items of a similar character were also incorporated in this Calendar. For example: Dr. T. W. Chambers had recently translated the Minutes of the Collegiate Church of New York, which had been kept in the Holland language until 1775. These translations made two large manuscript volumes, which he kindly loaned to the writer. All important documents were transcribed from these volumes and their titles put in this Calendar. Also references were given to all articles or important allusions of an ecclesiastical kind in those two great printed works of the State, before alluded to—the *Colonial Documents* and the *Documentary History*, fourteen volumes in all. And documents of all denominations, which were accessible at the time, were also referred to.

Now this Calendar enabled anyone interested in such matters to understand what material was available for the ecclesiastical history of New York. But it now began to be observed that these documents contained many allusions to other documents not in our possession. This led to the consideration of the question whether these were yet in existence, and, if so, [51] whether it would be possible to obtain them. Their existence was confirmed by a visit to the archives of the Classis of Amsterdam in 1885, of Rev. R. Randall Hoes, a chaplain in the United States Navy, and an enthusiastic student of our early Church history. For in 1880 those archives had been thoroughly overhauled, the bundles of letters classified in different portfolios, and thus much new material brought to light. Mr. Hoes was acquainted with the material already possessed, and it was at once evident to him that the searchers employed by Mr. Brodhead had not by any means secured all the letters from America on file. For there, before his eyes, were three portfolios, packed with letters from New York, New Jersey, and

Pennsylvania, although those seven bundles of original letters loaned to the General Synod in 1841, were supposed to be all that existed. And he also noticed by a cursory leafing through some of the volumes of the Minutes of the Classis many references to American affairs, concerning which he felt quite sure that transcripts did not exist in America.

These facts were discussed by interested friends and reported to the General Synod of 1887. As the writer was about to visit Holland, he was authorized by the Synod "to negotiate for said manuscripts, and to bring them, if proper arrangements could be made, to this country." He visited the archives and gained permission to make a cursory examination, and observed the same facts which Mr. Hoes had reported. It being the month of August, and the ministers being mostly away from home, no meeting of the Classis could at that time be secured. He traveled, however, down to Dokkum, in Zeeland, to call upon Dr. A. G. Vos, the Stated Clerk of the Classis, and talk upon the subject. He finally prepared a letter to the Classis, had it translated into Dutch and printed, and arranged to have a copy sent to the Classis, officially, and to each member separately. It referred to the former searches and explained the present desires of the General Synod. The Classis in due time sent him a reply, expressing their pleasure that the American Church was taking such an interest in her early history, but declared that they could not dispose of any of their documents, [52] as they belonged to the "Universitas." They would, however, furnish every facility for transcription. These facts were reported to the next Synod.

It did not seem feasible just then to take further action toward securing this new material, but friends interested in the matter did not forget it. In 1895 Dr. Chambers requested that a copy of the Calendar above alluded to should be furnished for the Library of the Collegiate Church, so that in case said Church should seek to secure the additional material, any possible duplications might be avoided. A

copy of the Calendar was accordingly prepared, but just before its delivery Dr. Chambers died.

In connection with the duplication of this Calendar, however, interest was revived in this whole business. A meeting was called by the remaining members having charge of these documents, of a few gentlemen, to consider the practicability of securing the rest of this Amsterdam Correspondence, combining it with that already possessed as well as with other collateral documents of a similar nature, and ultimately securing the publication of the whole. After discussion, resolutions were adopted respecting the importance of collecting all available material of this character, relating to New York and vicinity; of translating the parts not in English; of combining similar material from other sources, and printing the whole; and that it was desirable to send an agent to Holland familiar with the subject to make an exhaustive search of the Church Archives there, both Classical and Synodical, and secure transcripts of all important material; that a committee be appointed to carry out these plans, secure funds, and send the writer to Holland for this purpose. Other meetings were held, reports were made to the Synods of 1896 and 1897, which heartily endorsed the whole enterprise, and ordered Synodical credentials to be given to said agent.

Will you kindly pardon the writer if, to avoid circumlocution, he henceforth speaks more or less frequently in the first person.

I started on my mission in August, 1897, and returned in November, 1898, having been engaged fifteen months in this [53] enterprise. Before going I collected about sixty of our church histories, a few of a general character, but most of them local histories, in book or pamphlet form, some of them beautifully gotten up, to present to the Classis of Amsterdam. At the first meeting of the Classis after my arrival, September 27, 1897, Rev. Dr. Philip Hoedemaker, one of the ministers of the Classis and a well-known writer, who had

also received a part of his education in Rutgers College, introduced me to the Classis, stating the general object of my mission. I then referred to the care which the Classis had taken, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of about a hundred Dutch churches, many of which had now become among the strongest and most influential in the land. Allusion was made to the former researches of Mr. Brodhead, and of the earnest desire of the American Dutch Church now to complete its collection of documentary material for her history. The historical works, general and local, representing somewhat the progress of the Dutch Church in America, were now brought to the table and presented to the Classis from her children in America. The request was then formally made that such facilities might be accorded the Synod's agent, in making searches in their archives, and securing transcripts of material relating to America, as the Classis might deem proper.

The Classis at once took the most kindly interest in the enterprise; referred to the American Dutch Church as her oldest and strongest daughter, and gave me unrestricted privilege to examine every volume and document in their possession, running back for more than three centuries. Employing all necessary clerical help, I spent nine months, almost daily, in the archives at Amsterdam, becoming thoroughly familiar with its treasures. I confined myself to the duty of searching, and was rewarded beyond all anticipation. I soon discovered what was called an "Inventory" of the archives. This had been made, apparently, at the overhauling and reclassification of the material in 1880, and was of considerable use at first in giving me a general idea of their contents. A translation of this "Inventory" with some notes made upon it, will be found in the *Ecclesiastical Records*, vol. vi., pages 4394–4405.

[54] Among the first things examined were those three portfolios of letters labeled New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, containing material which had come to light since

Brodhead's time. There were between three and four hundred documents in these portfolios relating to New York and New Jersey alone, but all between the years 1700 and 1800, and not a few of them were in a perishing condition. My Calendar soon showed that about ninety per cent of these letters were to us new material. About fifty of them were from the Collegiate Church, although often dealing with general affairs; about fifty from churches in New Jersey, and the remainder from churches along the Hudson or Mohawk or from Long Island. Among these were also found copies of most of the lost Minutes of the first general ecclesiastical body of the American Church, called the Coetus. This find was especially valuable, as it filled up several gaps in the history. The transcripts of the material in these two portfolios made about a thousand pages of documentary matter not possessed before. These transcripts were bound in four volumes and properly labeled.

It next became my pleasant task to examine the volumes of Minutes and other records of that most cosmopolitan of all ecclesiastical bodies—the Classis of Amsterdam. From 1500 to 1800 it was, by far, the greatest missionary agency in the world. There was a peculiar delight in turning over the successive pages of their Acts during the whole of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was a passing panorama of church history, showing the unequaled activities of that Classis, in dealing not only with its home churches, but with about twenty colonies, some of them containing scores of churches, and New Netherland containing ultimately about a hundred. The older volumes were written in the peculiar Gothic chirography used in Holland before the eighteenth century. A specimen of it may be seen in the facsimile of the letter of Rev. Jonas Michaelius, a small portion of which is also given in the *Ecclesiastical Records of New York*, volume one, page 236.

These volumes were generally closely written, one of their large pages making three or four pages of our legal

paper. It [55] did not seem necessary to examine volumes one and two (1578–1620), as they antedated the real settlement of Manhattan; but volumes three to eighteen were carefully examined, page by page, with the one object of securing everything relating to New York and New Jersey. This task was greatly facilitated by the fact that every paragraph had a brief marginal note as to its general contents; and also that all proper names in these paragraphs, in the midst of all that Gothic chirography, were written in our present familiar Latin script, and were therefore at once distinctly recognizable on the page. The parts to be copied were indicated by a light pencil line along the margin; while references to all new items were also put in the Calendar. Some of the Indian names of American localities were spelled in a most marvelous manner, and also some English names were not always recognizable at first sight. There was a Dutch church established in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, near the spot where the famous Presbyterian Log College was located. This church was referred to on the margin by the one word, *Buxconti*. It was not recognized until after uttering it two or three times.

The transcripts of material relating to our American Dutch churches secured from these Minutes of the Classis amounted to nearly 400 pages, making about 1400 in all, thus far, of new material. In going over these Minutes it was interesting to observe the panorama of almost all the Dutch domines of colonial times, one after another, in due procession, passing in review. They generally appeared first as students, seeking advice or help; then presenting themselves for examination for licensure to preach. But before examination they were always required to exercise their gifts in preaching before the Classis. A text was assigned them, generally beforehand, and if their treatment of the proposition—*propositie doen*—as it was called was satisfactory, their examination was proceeded with. Subsequently these same students, when they had received a call, presented them-

selves for a final examination and for ordination. They were again required, first, to preach. The names of all these parties were well-known to us, but we had always thought of them under the aspect of venerable men who were [56] leaders in the Church. But now they appear as youths, and we seemed to hear their youthful sermons as they struggled on such texts (for the texts were always given) as "Kiss the Son lest he be angry"; "Being justified by faith"; "Walk in the Spirit"; "Search the Scriptures," etc. We had expected to see some evidences of the rationalism of those days, but there was not the slightest trace of it in all those Minutes, so far as the writer observed, but rather the contrary. It is, perhaps, worth mentioning, that the terms for the Preparatory and Final Examinations, all through these Minutes, were always expressed in French—*Examen Préparatoire; Examen Péremptoire.* Could these have been terms coming down from Calvin's time, or perhaps from the University of Paris? The candidate was generally ordained by the laying on of hands of the presiding officer alone. Then comes the statement of this newly ordained one sailing for the distant regions of America; and the report of the fact is also generally repeated in the Minutes of the next session of the Synod of North Holland.

After 1771, when semi-independence was granted to the American Dutch Church, items relating to America become much less numerous; and during the period of our Revolution very little is found. The Minutes of the American Synod, however, were sent over in manuscript copies, quite regularly, until 1792, when the American Church, by adopting its own Constitution, became entirely independent. The Classis of Amsterdam, however, kept the Article "New York and New Jersey" on their Minutes down to 1810; but for a succession of years before that date, there is found only the brief remark under that Article—*Geen bericht van Niew York en Jersey*—No information from New York and New Jersey.

The next duty was to search the Minutes of the *Deputati*

ad Res Exteras—the Committee on Foreign Affairs. These are contained in six closely written volumes. This Committee corresponded not only with the Dutch and German churches in America, but with those in the West Indies, in Guiana and Brazil; in Guinea and the Cape of Good Hope; in Hindustan, Ceylon, Borneo, Java, Formosa, and other islands in the Pacific, as well as with Japan. Frequent references were made to the [57] Edicts in Japan against Christianity, but the original documents bearing on this subject were not met with. This Committee corresponded also with Dutch churches in several cities of the Russian and Turkish Empires and in other parts of Europe. They provided ministers or visitors for the sick for all these localities; made arrangements, financial and otherwise, in their behalf, with the Great Commercial Companies doing business in those lands; endeavored to settle difficulties which arose; gave advice; kept minutes of all their proceedings; recorded their own letters in a series of volumes; filed and indexed those received from abroad; made abstracts of, or gave extracts from the same, to the Classis for their information, reporting monthly. In writing to all these churches, they acted under general or specific instructions in each case. Their Minutes exhibit the same multitudinous variety of subjects as those of the Classis, and until about the year 1700, are written in the same peculiar Gothic chirography. The writing is exceedingly compact, perfectly clear, yet often difficult to read. In the first four volumes of these Minutes of the Deputies, 1639–1758, and numbered 20, 21, 22, 23, and covering about 120 years, abstracts of the foreign letters are frequently given. But in 1759 special volumes were set apart, for recording such abstracts or extracts; and sometimes entire letters are recorded. These volumes are numbered 33 and 34. The transcripts secured from these volumes of the Deputies made only 300 pages; for some of the material in these volumes had been already obtained from the original letters themselves.

We next came to the Minutes of the Synod of North Holland. These begin as far back as 1572, in the midst of the Spanish wars. The Minutes of all the Provincial Synods of the Northern Netherlands, from the years 1572 to 1620, have recently been published in eight volumes. This publication is very valuable, and although antedating the settlement of New York, contains much matter of great historical interest to Americans, and is in the quaint old Dutch of that period. A set of these Minutes was purchased for the Collegiate Church Library. There is another set in the Sage Library at New Brunswick.

[58] The writer began his systematic examination of the Minutes of the Synod of North Holland with the year 1621. All the volumes between 1621 and 1810 were examined, covering a period of 190 years. Brief abstracts or extracts from the letters of the colonial churches, including, of course, those from New Netherland, were also frequently found in these volumes. The ecclesiastical changes of ministers in Holland, and their deaths, are regularly reported; but such facts concerning our American ministers are not generally given. Their examinations, ordinations, and departures for America are, however, generally given.

Many items were noticed in these Minutes throwing light on the general policy of the Mother Church toward the colonial churches. For example, it had always been a question at what date the American churches had been committed to the care of the Classis of Amsterdam. The fact was certain, but writers, even Brodhead, always referred to it in general terms, without being able to give date or authority. The answer, as we learn from these Synodical Minutes, is expressed in a way not anticipated. The seaboard Classes seem all to have coveted the privilege of taking charge of any of the colonial churches. To settle the matter, the Synod decreed, in 1624, that any Classis, within whose bounds either of the great commercial companies established one or more of their offices, should take charge of the colonial

churches located within the sphere of influence of that office. We found, therefore, that the Classes of Hoorn, Enkhuysen, South Holland, Zeeland, as well as the Classis of Amsterdam, had all, to a greater or less extent in earlier times, had charge of certain of the Colonial Churches; but Amsterdam gradually became the chief seaport, and thus the Classis of Amsterdam came to be the Metropolitan of New Netherland. The above arrangement seems to have been made partly as a matter of convenience; for a Classis, and some particular office of one of the Companies, had to agree upon the minister to be sent; for the Companies supported the ministers abroad, even as the State did at home. Hence it was that Michaelius, the first minister of Manhattan, was sent over by the Classis of Enkhuysen, because the office of the Company [59] yet having charge of New Netherland at that time, was located at Hoorn, within the bounds of that Classis, but almost immediately after, we find that New Netherland is under the care of the Classis of Amsterdam, the charge of New Netherland having been transferred to the Company's office at Amsterdam. The other Classes frequently complained of the very extensive powers of the Classis of Amsterdam, while all the Classes had an equal interest in the welfare of the colonial churches; and efforts were repeatedly made to make this supervision general, but without success.

It was an interesting circumstance to find the name of New York's first minister in the Minutes of the Synod of North Holland in 1621, seven years before he came to New York. He was a delegate to that Synod from the Classis of Enkhuysen and the church of Hem. His name appears again in those Minutes in 1625, when he is reported as having left Hem in order to go to San Salvador, Brazil; but it never again occurred in the Minutes of that Synod, but it can hardly be otherwise than that it would occur in the Minutes of some other Synod. It occurs only incidentally in the Minutes of the Classis of Amsterdam, of which body it does not appear that he was ever a member. His original home was prob-

ably in or near the city of Hoorn. Another letter of his has recently come to light, written from Manhattan to some friend in the vicinity of Hoorn, and dated five days before his famous letter which was first discovered about fifty years ago. I intended to visit those localities to make further investigations, but upon inquiry by letter beforehand, I was informed that the Classis of Enkhuysen had been united with that of Hoorn, and the records of both Classes had been destroyed in 1838, when the church of Hoorn was burned. The church of Hem was also burned in 1897, within a week after my arrival in Amsterdam.

It was interesting and somewhat amusing to find our American churches at first classed under the general head of "Indian Affairs"; and our churches placed alongside of those in Borneo, Java, Ceylon, the West India Islands, etc. But a process of differentiation went on with each generation, and this heading was at length divided into "East Indies" and "West Indies," [60] respectively, which left us more definitely on the Western Hemisphere. We were now classed with Guiana, Curaçao, St. Thomas, St. John, etc. Subsequently "West Indies" was divided into "West Indies" proper, and "North America," and now we were left safely on the continent; and, finally, about the middle of the eighteenth century, another division was made into the churches of "New York and New Jersey" and those of "Pennsylvania." But the geography of these provinces was not always very clear to the mind of the scribe. Kingston, on the Hudson, is described as in New England, and other churches in New York are sometimes put in Pennsylvania.

The transcripts secured from the Minutes of the Synod of North Holland amounted to 1300 pages. These were bound in five volumes, properly labeled and dated, and all these manuscript volumes are now deposited in the archives of the General Synod in the Sage Library at New Brunswick.

Full translations of all this material have been made, and

so much of it as was of special historical interest has been published by the State of New York in the six volumes known as *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York*, 1901–1905.

After churches were founded in the several Dutch colonies it became a custom to have the annual Minutes of the Synod of North Holland transcribed in a neat and beautiful hand, and one copy sent to each colony, to be passed around among the ministers. Indeed, Michaelius, the first minister in Manhattan, as early as 1628, makes special request that the Synodical Acts should be sent to him. Scribes were continually employed for this work. Written copies of each of the seven Provincial Synods were also sent to each of the other Synods, as well as to about twenty different colonies. Several complaints are found in the Amsterdam Correspondence that the ministers in New York kept such copies in their own hands too long, to the detriment of the more rural churches. A half dozen copies of such Minutes yet remain in the archives of the General Synod. There are many manuscript duplicates of the Minutes of the various Synods yet to be found in the archives at Amsterdam and The Hague. A little effort might secure a complete set of [61] the Minutes of the Synod of North Holland for the archives of the Reformed Church in America. The Minutes of all the northern Synods have been printed, as before said, from 1572–1620, in eight volumes but none since the latter date.

Archives at The Hague

The "*Ryk's Archief*" or Royal Archives at The Hague, located on the Plein or Square, are simply appalling. One sees there thousands of manuscript volumes, and, perhaps, an equal number of portfolios bursting with documents, and filling scores of rooms and passageways, from floor to ceiling on successive stories. Into these rooms we simply looked as a matter of curiosity. These archives are for the secular

historian; but the General Synod of the Netherlands Church has also its archives at The Hague.

The present General Synod dates back only to 1816. Since that time their Minutes have been regularly printed, and one set is to be found in the Sage Library at New Brunswick. These Minutes would have no special historical interest to us as Americans, unless it should be in reference to the more recent secessions from the old National Church of Holland, beginning about 1836, and which has sent, since that time, at least 100,000 Hollanders to Michigan and other western States.

Owing to political complications, no General Synod was held in Holland for nearly two centuries, or from 1619 to 1816. The seven Provincial Synods were each supreme within their own territory, but kept themselves informed of one another's proceedings by the exchange of Minutes, and by the visits of the Deputati of each Synod to each of the other Synods, who made full reports to their own Synod.

But the archives of the General Synod at The Hague are very extensive and contain a unique collection of records and documents, although not many relating to New York. They are located in a synodical building at 100 Java Street. The older records are kept in two very large iron safes. These contain about 250 manuscript volumes, besides scores of bundles of papers. Many odd volumes of Minutes are also found here [62] of different Classes, as, for instance, seven volumes of the old Classis of Delft, which might contain items about the Puritans, also two volumes of the synodical correspondence. Among these treasures are found the original Minutes, in one stout volume, of those six early Synods, 1568–1586, which formulated the Presbyterian polity of the Church of the Netherlands. Two of these Synods, those of Wesel, 1568, and Embden, 1571, were held outside Holland territory, because of the dreadful persecutions within. The other four of these formative Synods were held at Dordrecht, 1574, 1578, at Middelburg, 1581,

and at The Hague, 1586. One cannot fail to look with veneration on such a volume as he thinks of the faith and perseverance of those old saints, who, while the Spaniards were despoiling their homes, were organizing their Church on foreign soil, not doubting in their new-found Evangelical faith that God would give them the victory. The Minutes of these Synods have been repeatedly printed in Dutch, but never yet in English. But since they exhibit the gradual development of the Presbyterian polity in Holland, an English edition would be instructive and suggestive. A copy of this polity was sent by request to the Westminster Assembly. (See *Ecclesiastical Records, N. Y.* i., 185, 192.) Their translation has recently been secured by the writer, and it is hoped some way may be found for their publication.

These archives at The Hague also contain complete sets of the Minutes of each of the Provincial Synods of the Netherlands—of Guelderland, Friesland, Overyssel, Groningen, Utrecht, South Holland, and North Holland, with many duplicate copies. The loose papers of the Synod of South Holland are also here, and are very numerous, among which are many documents relating to Pennsylvania. There are but few papers here relating to New York, as the correspondence of the churches of New York was almost exclusively with the Classis of Amsterdam, and to a very limited extent with the Synod of North Holland.

Here are also the original Minutes and notes of that translation of the Bible into Dutch, which was issued in 1637. These Minutes fill many volumes. This was the translation which [63] was in common use among the Dutch in America for almost two centuries.

In these archives are also found the original Minutes of that famous Synod of Dort, 1618–19, in nineteen large volumes. On the title-page of the first volume is found, in a large, bold hand, "Written by me, Festus Hommius, the scribe of the Synod." This Synod was in session for six months, and there were delegates present from all the Re-

formed Churches of Europe, except that of France, whose delegates were forbidden to attend by the King. The business was conducted in Latin. The books are in a perfect state of preservation, and now, after nearly three centuries, the ink is just as black as if written yesterday. Here are also the original signatures of all the delegates. Each of the five Heads of Doctrine, or of topics then discussed, is signed separately by all the delegates present, so that all the signatures are repeated five times, and each set fills five pages. Photographic copies of these signatures were secured.

The Post-Acta of this Synod dealt more particularly with the local polity of the Church, after the doctrinal discussion was finished, and the foreign delegates had departed. These proceedings were also in Latin. As it had become impossible to find Latin copies of the Post-Acta (Dutch copies were not uncommon), the writer secured photographic copies of the sixty-four pages of these Minutes, reduced in size one-half. Since then, however, Dr. Kuyper, the celebrated theologian of the Seceder Church, and statesman, has published an edition in Latin and Dutch, in parallel columns, with his own excellent annotations. A copy of this has been secured and is in the Sage Library.

A medal, commemorating this Synod of Dort, is still preserved among many similar curiosities, at the Royal Library in The Hague. This I had the privilege not only of seeing, but handling. Bizot, in his *Medallic History of Holland*, thus describes the device upon it:

> A mountain, upon whose top a temple stands, toward which a few people are clambering up along a steep and rugged way. Winds are blowing with great vehemence against the four corners of this mountain. These [64[winds represent the dissemination of "Novelties" (Nieuwegheden), which attempt, but in vain, to disquiet the State; nevertheless the United Provinces stand firm in their religion.

In all these records there are many items relating to English-speaking churches, in Holland, and to Dutch churches in

other parts of Europe. The English-speaking churches in Holland were composed largely of the descendants of English merchants, and especially of the descendants of English and Scotch soldiers, sent over by Elizabeth to help the Dutch against the Spaniards. There were, first and last, thirty or more English Presbyterian churches in Holland, of which there now remain only those of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and Middelburg. There was also at one time an English Synod.

There are also many references to Dutch churches in England. There have been, in all, not less than 30 or 40 of these, and there are also references to a Dutch Synod in England. There were, at one time, no less than eight Dutch churches in London, of which the chief and, perhaps, the only surviving one, is the well-known church of Austin Friars, whose history has recently been issued in four portly volumes. Some of the other Dutch churches in England were at Norwich, Colchester, Yarmouth, Sandwich, Maidstone, Dover, Canvey Island, Stamford, Thetford, etc., besides the Dutch Chapel Royal at Westminster.

While in London I also visited the Archives in the Somerset House, on the Strand. Besides the numerous civil records there to be found, one may also find there most of the records of the dissenting churches of England and Wales of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These were deposited there about 1836, by request of Parliament. Before that date only the parish records, in distinction from the dissenters' records, were allowed as legal evidence in the courts. But upon condition of the dissenting records being also deposited there, under proper authentication, such records were also to be allowed as legal evidence, in reference to births, marriages, etc. Most of the dissenting churches at once complied. The Quakers held aloof for twenty years, when they also complied and deposited in these archives about 7000 manuscript volumes. [65] The custodian kindly took me through the extensive vaults where these records are kept.

All these volumes have been rebound, classified, labeled, and catalogued, and any volume can be produced in a few moments. I asked for the volume of the Dutch Chapel Royal, at Westminster, founded in 1688, by William III, England's Dutch King. It was quickly produced.

To this chapel in 1704, Rev. John P. Nucella, the Dutch minister of Kingston, N. Y., was called, and he officiated there for eighteen years, until his death in 1722. Dutch preaching was continued in this chapel until 1809, when the building was burned. It was then determined to discontinue the Dutch services, which had been conducted there for 122 years.

If time and other circumstances had permitted, additional items of interest might have been found at the birthplaces of the Dutch ministers or at some of their places of settlement in Holland, before or after their residence in America, as the church and town records are generally very complete. The General Catalogues of the Universities of Leyden, Utrecht, Groningen, etc., also indicate the ages, residences, studies, and sometimes other particulars of all their students. From these many facts were obtained respecting most of our colonial Dutch ministers. Copies of these catalogues, which are costly, were purchased for the library of the Collegiate Church of New York.

It is believed that all the official documents to be found in the Church archives of Holland have now been gathered and issued in these *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York*. These volumes also include a large mass of additional material from the several other sources indicated, including abstracts of several Dutch pamphlets of colonial times. Probably no other records, pertaining to our earlier denominations, are so complete, as those relating to the one hundred pre-Revolutionary Dutch churches of New York and New Jersey, for official correspondence with Holland was continued for about a century and three-quarters; and all this material, now extant, has been published by the State of New York, in

six volumes, during the years 1901–1905. The calendar of this material is now represented [66] by the tables of contents of these volumes, in which an analysis of the more important documents is also given. What the work yet needs to make its multitudinous material available is an elaborate index of names and topics.[1]

[1] The Legislature made an appropriation for this index in 1907, but with the change of the State Historians about that time, this work is yet delayed. [On the basis of an appropriation secured in 1912, Dr. Corwin is preparing the index for publication in 1913.]

The Genesis of the Common Form of Public Worship in Our Non-Liturgical Churches

By

Williston Walker

THE GENESIS OF THE COMMON FORM OF PUBLIC WORSHIP IN OUR NON-LITURGICAL CHURCHES

By Williston Walker, Professor of Church History, Yale University

(*Read December 28, 1906*)

TILL within recent years, when a modern growth of church music, of responsive readings, and of other so-called "enrichments," has affected their services, the non-liturgical churches of America have followed an essentially rigid form of public worship. That form still constitutes the underlying framework of their services, whatever modifications in its proportion and arrangement have been introduced. Strongly repudiating any liturgical forms throughout most of their American history, these churches have been tenacious as to the sequence and the general proportion of the elements of public worship. Their much-prized freedom has not been a freedom in practice in this regard. As constituted within the recollection of all here present, and as to be found widely in contemporary experience, the substantially unvarying service of the House of God began with a brief invocation, followed by the reading of the Bible, to which a hymn succeeded, to be followed by the "long prayer" of general supplication and thanksgiving. At its conclusion the sermon was preached. That ended, a brief prayer was offered, a second hymn was sung, and the congregation was dismissed with the benediction. Not infrequently the order of the prayer and hymn following the sermon was reversed;

but the essential sequence and proportion of the service were seldom otherwise varied. Such rigidity and uniformity must have its historic reasons; and the purpose of this brief paper is to set forth the more important steps by which our typical form of public worship came to be what it is.

[70] Its source is naturally to be sought in the origins of the worship of the Reformed Churches which are the spiritual ancestors of our American non-prelatical communions—that is, in the work of Calvin, Farel, and their associates; but the story of its development has its roots in usages antecedent even to their time. At the dawn of the Reformation, as in all Roman worship to this day, the central element in the public service was the mass. Its ancient ritual began with a brief invocation, followed by a confession of sin by the priest, the announcement of absolution to the penitent, to which succeeded the "introit," or introduction to the mass proper, consisting of a brief hymn, closing with the *Kyrie eleison* and the *Gloria*. To it succeeded the brief prayers known as "collects," the reading of the appropriate passages from the Epistles and the Gospels, the Nicene Creed, the consecration of the elements, the ascription "Holy, holy, holy"; the Lord's Prayer, the *Agnus Dei*; participation in the elements, a brief hymn of praise (the *Benedicamus*), and the concluding benediction. Celebrated, indeed, by the priest and the choir or by the priest alone, it consisted, therefore, when reduced to its simplest terms, of a service in the following order: A sentence, the confession, the absolution, a hymn, the Scriptures, the communion itself, a hymn, and the benediction.

The reformers modified this ancient liturgy in four main directions. They insisted that worship be in the language of the people instead of in Latin; they provided for much more extensive reading of the Scriptures; they made, save in England, a chief place for the sermon; and, in the non-Lutheran and non-Anglican churches, they divorced the communion from its historic and central place in all public worship, though Calvin at heart desired that it be retained

as the crowning feature of every Sunday morning's service.

In all the churches of the Reformation changes were rapidly effected, bringing these principles more or less fully into practice; but the historic line which most intimately affects the churches of America runs through Strassburg and Geneva. As early as 1533, Farel published a liturgical outline at Neuchatel, which much resembled that established in German-speaking [71] Bern in 1529, and was introduced by Farel with the Reformation into Geneva, being in use by 1537, if not earlier.[1] A relatively crude revision, it gave no place to song in public worship, but it retained the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Apostles' Creed, and, what was more important for the future, gave a place for a free prayer. It was doubtless used during Calvin's first stay in Geneva.

No part of Calvin's life was more important in his spiritual and mental development, however, than the three years, from 1538 to 1541, which he spent in Strassburg. It was here that he came in contact with the type of public worship that, modified to suit Genevan prejudices after his return to that city in 1541, was to form the general model of the Calvinistic churches. Calvin was not a liturgical innovator, and recent investigation has amply proved that for his little church of French refugees in Strassburg he translated, with only minor verbal alterations and improvements, the liturgy which had grown by successive stages under the leadership of Strassburg divines from the German mass of Diebold Schwarz, of 1524, to the ampler form of Bucer and his associates, in use certainly by 1539.[2] As taken over from its German original in Strassburg, for the employment of the French congregation of which Calvin was pastor, it began with a sentence of invocation, and the confession of sins still

[1] [Farel,] *La Manière et Fasson quon tient . . . es lieux que Dieu de sa grace a visites . . .* ed. J. W. Baum, Strassburg, 1859; Schaff, vii., 370.

[2] On the subject see A. Erichson, *Die Calvinische und die Altstrassburgische Gottesdienstordnung*, Strassburg, 1890; Doumergue, Jean Calvin, ii., 488–504.

in general use among the Reformed Churches of the Continent. Then followed an announcement of absolution to all who repent, and "seek Jesus Christ for their salvation." This order was that, it will be remembered, of the mass, though with much necessary modification of expression. As in the mass, a hymn now succeeded, so in the liturgy of Strassburg a service of song now followed, not the old "introit," but the first four Commandments in rhyme, sung by the whole congregation. A brief prayer for forgiveness and strength was followed by the similar singing of the remaining Commandments; and as the "collects" succeeded the "introit," *Kyrie*, and [72] *Gloria* in the mass, so here a brief prayer for spiritual illumination followed the singing of the Commandments. As in the mass, also, the reading of the Scriptures, in much extended fashion, next followed, to be succeeded by the sermon. That ended, then came, next in order, the long petition of general supplication, ending with a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer; in turn to be followed, as in the conclusion of the mass, by singing, in Strassburg, either of a psalm or the Apostles' Creed, and the benediction.

Calvin's return to Geneva, in 1541, was followed by extensive modification of this Strassburg service, partly by reason of the greater anti-Roman feeling of the little French-speaking city, and partly in the direction of a more considerable simplicity, such as had marked the relatively undeveloped service of Farel.[1] In opposition to his own preference he omitted the promise of absolution. He substituted the singing of a psalm for the chanting of the Commandments and the intermediate prayer. For the brief prescribed prayer before the sermon he now substituted, in conformity with Farel's usage, a free petition by the minister. Thus modified, the Calvinistic service attained its complete development. It now consisted of a sentence of invocation; next the confession, essentially that of Strassburg; a psalm was then sung, upon which the minister

[1] Text in *Calvini Opera quæ supersunt omnia*, Brunswick, 1863–1900, vi.

prayed in words of his own choosing; to this the sermon succeeded, followed by a long prescribed prayer of general petition, a psalm, and the benediction. No special place was assigned to the reading of Scripture, as had been the case at Strassburg, probably because a separate and elaborate weekly service of Bible exposition was established in Geneva for all who chose to attend its Friday sessions; though of course a passage of Scripture formed the basis of the sermon. The happy combination of fixed and free prayer continued thenceforth to be characteristic of the Reformed Churches of the Continent generally.

Such was the state of public worship in Geneva when it began profoundly to affect England and Scotland in the sixth [73] decade of the sixteenth century. Its liturgy had been published in England in English as early as 1550.[1] But the chief impression made by it was naturally upon those refugees from the Marian persecutions, who found a warm welcome from Calvin in Geneva, and who, in turn, came to look upon the Genevan constitution as a model of what reform should be. Among those who thus sought an asylum was John Knox, who was in Geneva in 1554. So strong was his liking for the simpler Genevan form, as contrasted with the second Edwardine Prayer Book, then only two years old, that in the disputes which rent the English-speaking congregation in Frankfort, in 1554, Knox, with four others,[2] prepared a form of service absolutely following that of Calvin in order, save that it contained no sentence of invocation, though differing from its prototype in the verbal expression of the two prescribed prayers. The objects of their petition and thanksgiving were, however, the same; and free prayer was directed in the same place in the service as by Calvin. When the defeated supporters of this freer service found a refuge in Geneva from the turmoils of Frankfort, they met a hearty welcome from Calvin, and were assigned the use of the

[1] By Whitchurche, see Procter and Frere, *New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, London, 1901, p. 88.

[2] Laing, *Works of John Knox*, Edinburgh, 1855, iv., 146.

"Auditoire" for their worship in November, 1555.[1] Of this congregation of refugees Knox was the pastor from 1556 till his epoch-making return to Scotland in 1559. And, in 1556, it published, at Geneva, with Calvin's approval, the modification of Calvin's liturgy just described, under the title *The Form of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, etc., Used in the English Congregation at Geneva.*[2] Other editions of this *Book of Geneva*, as it was soon called, appeared in 1561 and 1562—the last named printed in Edinburgh. Its influence not merely in Scotland, but in England, was great. By 1567, the English Puritans, of the more advanced wing, were using it in preference to the Elizabethan Prayer Book, by law established.[3] To them it continued the [74] guide for many years in public worship, and the *Booke of the Forme of Common Prayers*, presented by the Puritans to Parliament in 1584, was but a modification and enlargement of it.[4] The same is true of the form of service issued, in 1586, for Cartwright's congregation in Middelburg.

In Scotland this *Book of Geneva* experienced a speedy revision, in which John Knox bore conspicuous share. As issued in 1564, it is usually called *The Book of Common Order*, or, less appropriately, *John Knox's Liturgy.*[5] Though very much enlarged, especially in its provision for special services, its order of public worship reproduced exactly that of Calvin in its sequence, save that it omitted, as had the *Book of Geneva*, the sentence of invocation with which his form of worship began. *Knox's Liturgy* commences with a confession, of which four forms are offered for the use of the minister. Then followed a psalm by the congregation, sung in "plain time," a free prayer, the sermon, and the long liturgical general petition, ending, as at Geneva, with the

[1] *Opera*, xxi., 619, 620.

[2] Reprinted, Laing, *op. cit.*, iv., 149–214.

[3] Strype, *Life and Acts of . . . Edmund Grindal*, Bk. i., p. 114.

[4] Procter and Frere, *op. cit.*, pp. 131, 132.

[5] Full text in Sprott and Leishman, *The Book of Common Order . . . and the Directory*, Edinburgh, 1868, pp. 1–234.

Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed. To it a psalm and the benediction succeeded. It is evidence, however, of the direction in which most thoughts were turning in Scotland that the service has as a rubric the following declaration:

> It shall not be necessary for the Minister daily to repeat all these things before mentioned, but, beginning with some manner of confession, to proceed to the Sermon, which ended, he either useth *the Prayer for all Estates* before mentioned or else prayeth, as the Spirit of God shall move his heart, framing the same according to the time and matter which he hath entreated of.[1]

This left the liturgy really a Directory of Public Worship, though there is no doubt that its fixed prayers were generally followed for half a century after its introduction. Its order was always formative, and it remained the law of the Church of Scotland, from 1564 to 1645, save as external interference under James I and Charles I limited its use in their endeavor to introduce Episcopacy into the reluctant land.[2]

[75] It has doubtless been observed that the two services of Knox, like that of Calvin at Geneva, and unlike that used by Calvin in Strassburg, had no special place for the reading of Scripture. That was by reason of no undervaluation of this feature of public worship, but because Scottish custom, like that at Geneva, provided for its extensive use in a separate service. In Scotland it was the custom to precede the service proper, of which an outline has been given, by a special reading of the Scriptures, usually with prayer and singing, often of an hour's duration. This was conducted frequently, perhaps usually in the larger places, not by the minister, but by a "reader," and was often called the "reader's service." As time went on it became quite generally really one continuous service, the reader beginning with the fixed prayer assigned for the commencement of the morning service, following that with a psalm, and then with

[1] Sprott and Leishman, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. xv.

large selections from the Old and New Testaments. The minister then entered, and, after kneeling in private devotion in the pulpit, proceeded to the extempore prayer, which he followed with the sermon, and so pursued the service to its appointed end.[1] This combined form was to give a pattern for the *Westminster Directory* of 1645.

As the seventeenth century advanced, however, Episcopal emphasis on a prescribed liturgy in England, and ultimately in Scotland, led to increasing questioning, by its opponents, of the rightfulness of any forms of fixed prayer whatever. To Puritans such as John Cotton their employment seemed a breach of the second Commandment[2]; and while Scotland did not go nearly as far in its feeling till the controversy was well advanced, throughout the first half of the seventeenth century increasing use was there made of the freedom in extempore prayer which *Knox's Liturgy* had permitted. The result was that the Westminster Assembly, in its *Directory* of 1645, while elaborately outlining the topics of petition, prescribed no fixed prayers whatever. The old historic order of the service was, however, left unchanged; though its proportion in one important [76] respect was altered.[3] As prescribed in this famous outline, the service opened with a brief prayer of invocation and confession. The Scriptures, preferably a chapter from each Testament, were then read. A psalm was sung. There next followed, instead of the brief prayer for illumination characteristic of the worship we have thus far studied, a long prayer, acknowledging our unworthiness, voicing thanksgiving for the Gospel, praying for the spread of the Kingdom of God, and making intercession for all in authority, for schools and for all conditions of men, closing with an invocation of blessing on the sermon. The "long prayer," which had thus far been that

[1] Sprott and Leishman, *The Book of Common Order . . . and the Directory*, p. xxxiii.

[2] *Modest and Cleare Answer to Mr. Ball's Discourse*, London, 1642, p. 19.

[3] Sprott and Leishman, *The Book of Common Order . . . and the Directory*, pp. 281–323.

after the sermon, had come to its modern position in the service. But the Westminster Assembly was not unmindful of the early usage. A rubric, if such it can be called, declared[1]: "We judge this to be a convenient order in the ordinary Public Prayers; yet so, as the minister may defer (as in prudence he shall think meet) some part of these Petitions till after his Sermon."

The sermon succeeded, and was followed by a relatively brief prayer of thanksgiving and petition, ending with the Lord's Prayer. Then ensued the singing of a psalm and the benediction. Though the hymns were of course still exclusively rhymed passages of Scripture rather than what were then termed "human compositions," the non-liturgical service had assumed essentially the form with which we are familiar.

While these developments were occurring in the British Islands, their Puritan emigrants in New England were following similar lines. Accounts of public worship in Boston in 1642 and 1643, that is before the preparation of the *Westminster Directory*, show that the following order was in use: Prayer, Scripture reading, the singing of psalms, the sermon, prayer, a second psalm, and the benediction.[2] By 1719, when Cotton Mather wrote his *Ratio Disciplinæ*,[3] the usual apportionment was prayer, the singing of a psalm, the sermon, a shorter [77] prayer, a second psalm, and the benediction. It will be noted that the reading of the Scripture is omitted. This neglect was due to a peculiar local condition, the interpretation of the Word of God being deemed in early New England the function of the "teacher" rather than of the "pastor." With the extinction of the teachership, which scarcely survived the second generation on New England soil, the public reading of the Bible went with it, yet not wholly so, for Cotton Mather observes

[1] Sprott and Leishman, *The Book of Common Order . . . and the Directory*, p. 299.

[2] Lechford, *Plaine Dealing*, p. 16; Cotton, *Way of the Churches*, p. 67.

[3] Published at Boston in 1726, pp. 42–68.

that "the Custom of Reading the Scriptures without Explication and Exhortation upon it is practised in many of our churches."[1] So laudable a practice could not long remain in abeyance, and before the eighteenth century closed became once more well-nigh universal; yet, as late as 1810, the Litchfield South Consociation of Connecticut thought it necessary to commend the custom to the churches under its care. Presbyterian practice, always influenced by the *Westminster Directory*, affected New England, however, and Professor Thomas C. Upham, writing of the usage in 1829, thus outlines the service[2]:

> The morning worship on the Sabbath, commonly commences with a short prayer, in which the blessing of God is invoked, in particular, on the solemn acts of worship, which are to be performed. Then follow the reading of the Scriptures, singing, renewed supplications and the preaching of the Word. The Sermon is followed by another prayer, and in the afternoon by prayer and singing. The services are closed by a benediction of the pastor.

This, it will be noted, is the exact sequence of the *Westminster Directory*.

We have thus followed our modern non-liturgical service from its pre-Reformation beginnings to the recent multiform modifications of the present. It has been subject to many changes. The Reformation translated it into the language of the people, and swept away the communion as its central element, substituting the sermon. Genevan prejudice robbed it of the absolution; while Farel's practice, accepted by Calvin, gave a place in it for free prayer. Till the controversies of the [78] seventeenth century, it remained in part at least liturgical, two of its prayers being prescribed in form, even if not obligatory in Scottish and Puritan usage. Those controversies, the fruits of which were illustrated in the *Directory* prepared by the Westminster divines, swept away

[1] Published at Boston in 1726, p. 65.

[2] *Ratio Disciplinæ*, Portland, 1829, p. 247.

all fixed prayer, minimized, if they did not abolish, the opening confession, omitted the creed, and changed the place of the "long prayer" of general supplication characteristic of early Reformation days from its position after to before the sermon. Puritan prejudice in England and New England led to the omission of the Lord's Prayer, which even the *Westminster Directory* had retained. But through all these changes a certain likeness to its pre-Reformation original has been preserved, and a real continuity of worship can be traced. Most of the "enrichments" of the present are efforts to restore that which has been dropped in this historic development. As such they have their ample justification. In a real sense the services of our non-liturgical churches link themselves with the historic past, and belong to the worship of the Church universal.

Basil and Jerome Compared

By

John Lewis Ewell

BASIL AND JEROME COMPARED

By John Lewis Ewell, Professor of Church History, Howard University

(*Read Dec. 28, 1906*)

BASIL was born about 329 A.D., and died 379 A.D. Jerome was born about 340 and died 420. So Basil was Jerome's senior by some eleven years, while Jerome outlived Basil over forty years.

A recent reading of both Basil and Jerome has impressed me vividly with the contrast between the two Fathers at one point, and on reflection I have thought that possibly in respect to a number of traits it might be interesting to put them side by side. If the contrast is not in all respects a sharp one, the lover of Plutarch will recall that in some cases the same is true of his heroes.

Their most striking divergence was as to celibacy, not but that both were celibates, indeed they were both ascetics in general, of the most relentless kind, addicted to a vegetable diet, scanty and ragged clothing, insufficient and interrupted sleep on the bare ground, only indulging in a bath in case of severe illness and conspicuous for "unwashedness." Alas, for the world, Basil outstripped Jerome in asceticism so that while the latter lived to be fourscore, Basil, the brightest star of the Cappadocian firmament, vanished at fifty, and he was even then an old man, burdened and broken with manifold diseases. But when it came to celibacy, Jerome let his ascetic principles run away with him. His great aim and de-

light and warfare even was to promote the unmarried state, and to obliterate [82] every impulse in the opposite direction. Of course, he tolerated marriage. It was necessary in order to save the race from extinction; he even claimed to honor marriage; it was, he said, that part of the Lord's field which yielded thirty-fold, although the chief gain which he expected from marriage was virgins—that is, those who should be devoted by their parents to the celibate life, but what he emphasized was the sixty-fold of unbroken widowhood and the hundred-fold of life-long celibacy. This was the angelic life on earth. It filled his heart with joy if a little girl of ten were consecrated by her parents to the virgin life. When the fair and high-born Blesilla was left a widow at twenty, he devoted himself to fortifying her resolution not to remarry, and to fostering in the gentle, intellectual, and spiritually minded young lady ascetic practices to the most cruel degree. Hers is a tragic instance of severity to the body. When eight months later she was borne to the grave with all the pomp of a Roman patrician funeral, a great outcry arose against the monks, and particularly against Jerome as the cause of her untimely death, and the demand was—Away with the monks, stone them, hurl them into the Tiber—so that Jerome withdrew from Rome through fear of the vengeance of the mob. If he wrote to a widow, it was to adjure her against a second marriage. He rejoiced when married people resolved to live as though they were unmarried, and if, after such a vow they resumed the conjugal relation and, as happened in one instance, the wife did penance for her supposed sin by a pilgrimage to Palestine, he applauded her and did his utmost to induce her husband to lay upon himself a like punishment. His letters, and that when writing to women, are so full of denunciations of all sexual impulses and they go into so minute details that it would seem as though they must have stimulated the very thing which they denounced with such vehemence and iteration.

When you pass from the writings of Jerome to those of

Basil, you breathe a different atmosphere. He agreed with Jerome in his interpretation of the thirty- and sixty- and hundred-fold and in regarding the celibate as the angelic life, but he does not permit a girl to take the vow of virginity [83] until she knows what she is doing—that is, has reached at least sixteen or seventeen years. When he writes to widows it is to comfort them with the thought of the noble character of their deceased husbands, or of the divine love and wisdom that will make their bereavement a blessing, with never a word of warning against a remarriage, and in all his writings there is a refreshing absence of that minute and morbid and indelicate detail which is so prominent and offensive in Jerome.

Jerome was notoriously a violent saint. Did Jovinian venture the assertion that pure married life was as holy as celibacy?—his writings were but, "the hissings of the old serpent." Vigilantius advocated views similar to those of Jovinian, therefore his books were "vomited forth in a drunken fit." A Roman Catholic friend who is now a bishop in that Church, once remarked to me that literature can show nothing more vituperative than Jerome's denunciations of Vigilantius. He likens Ambrose to the croaking raven and to the ungainly jackdaw. Pelagius offered no point of attack in his character so he is described as "a stupid fool laboring under his load of Scotch porridge"—a criticism that would have pleased Dr. Johnson. When his bosom friend Rufinus, ventured to differ from him he became "a grunter." Jerome's bitter pen did not spare the dead. He termed Rufinus after his death "the scorpion." It would seem that Ruskin could not have read Jerome extensively, else he would not extol his "sweetness of character."[1] Basil, while not altogether superior to the prevalent violence in language, was far more courteous than his times.

In theology, Jerome had no mind of his own. He was most of all consistent in his unwavering determination to be

[1] *Our Fathers have told us.*—Chap. iii., "The Lion-Tamer."

orthodox, whatever that might mean to the Church. He writes to Bishop Damasus of Rome, that he has hitherto maintained but one hypostasis in the Trinity, but if he, Damasus, decrees that there are three, he will not hesitate to speak of three. Basil, on the contrary, is preëminently a leader and originator in theology. His work on the Holy Spirit was the worthy successor and supplement of the writings of Athanasius on the Deity of the Son.

[84] Basil had an altogether broader and richer and more winsome nature than Jerome. Jerome was not absolutely without humor. He commends Eustochium, who had consecrated her wealth and rank and beauty to a life of perpetual virginity by contrasting her with some "rough, unsightly countrified fright, who most likely never married because she could not find a husband,"—an outline sketch suggesting Burns's line, "Ye 're aiblins nae temptation." But playful sallies are hard to find in Jerome.

Basil, on the contrary, often permits the bright thread of humor to light up his serious thought. If he is persecuted by an unlettered tool of the emperor who bears the name of the prince of Greek orators, he terms him an illiterate Demosthenes. If the imperial minister threatens to torture him unless he will submit, he replies: "If you will cut out my liver you will do me a great kindness, for it has always been a trouble to me where it is." He begs the workingmen in his audience to be patient with his long sermon, for he says, the longer I preach, the longer you will be kept from dice and similar evils. He writes to a man who has regained his appetite by eating pickled cabbage, that for the future he shall think nothing is equal to that dish. Basil took delight in the beautiful landscape of his picturesque Cappadocia, in the grandeur of the starry heavens, and in the variety and mystery and mutual adaptability of plants. His *Hexameron*, or *Discourses on the Six Days of Creation*, abounds in beautiful passages which illustrate his appreciation of the book of nature.

Jerome and Basil were both familiar with the classics, although Basil's five years in Athens gave a polish to his education which Jerome never attained. Jerome's famous dream made him abjure the classics, but he could not keep his vow, for his writings to his latest years abound in classical allusions. Basil's appreciation of the classics suffered no such shock. He always delighted in them, and, if the correspondence attributed to them be, as is commonly supposed, genuine, continued in familiar relations with the great heathen humanist Libanius and sought out pupils for him, whom Libanius gladly taught, if necessary, for nothing.

[85] Basil was a democrat. While he bore himself with dignity, possibly not without a touch of pride, because of his high birth, rare education, rigorous asceticism, and exalted position as Archbishop of Cappadocia, he affirmed that all men are by nature deserving of equal honor. He ridicules abstinence from swine's flesh, because every creature of God is good and to be received with thanksgiving. He bids his hearers sail the voyage of life by the constellations of the commandments of God. Passages striking for their vigorous and beautiful thought and liberal spirit are far more frequent in Basil than in Jerome.

Jerome far surpasses Basil in pictures of his time. His long residence in Rome and probably a natural aptness for vivid narrative, account for this. To him we owe the most lifelike descriptions that have come down to us of the luxury and profligacy of the later empire, of its women with painted cheeks and eyebrows, towering headgear, and girdles so tight as nearly to cut them in two, and of their perfumed and mincing beaux, of the intoxication that made their banquets disgusting, and of the immorality that found its way even into the ranks of priests and nuns. It is he above all others who has given us our most graphic and lurid pictures of the sack of Rome in 410 with its carnival of pillage, lust, and murder, and the agony that spread to all the shores of the Mediterranean, and even filled the religious homes of distant

Bethlehem, where Jerome dwelt, with throngs of ragged, starving, and wounded fugitives.

Both lives afford an illustrious exhibition of courage whose memory shall never die. Basil resisted the Arian emperor, Valens, at peril of torture, confiscation, and banishment, and the bishop overawed the emperor. When Valens entered Basil's church there was something in its spiritual atmosphere, its throng of devout worshippers, its mighty waves of sacred song, and above all in that majestic figure of the presiding archbishop, the wasted and worn ascetic, yet the eloquent preacher in whose countenance there was something of almost more than human purity and dignity and sympathy that overmastered the imperial haughtiness, and Valens held a private [86] interview with Basil in a retired room of the cathedral and left a gift for the archbishop's asylums which were on so vast a scale as to be designated "the new city." The reconciliation of the emperor was, however, as momentary as that of Saul to the outlawed David. Basil became an exile, and the congregation of his diocese, because they had caught his inflexible adherence to the Athanasian faith, were turned out of their churches and compelled to worship God in the open air in the rigors of winter amid the Cappadocian mountains.

Jerome showed at once his indomitable courage and his breadth of view as a translator of the Bible. This work of his presents at once his great monument and the noblest aspect of his character. The current versions were corrupt and conflicting, but they were intrenched in the affection and respect of many generations. To change them seemed to the popular mind little short of sacrilege. Because Jerome did this, he brought down on himself the bitterest denunciations, and congregations were rent into parties for and against the change. In at least one instance, which is probably typical of many, a bishop almost lost his position for presuming to quote one of Jerome's new renderings. In all this Jerome was condemned as the troubler of Israel, but none of these

things moved him. He repaid vituperation in kind with interest,—for meekness was never his specialty,—and labored on with the sympathy of the more enlightened, and with generous gifts even from distant Spain to defray the wages of copyists. He did not hesitate to call in the help of Jewish rabbis in deciphering the Hebrew. He believed that he had the mighty aid of the prayers of the apostle Paul. The cave in Bethlehem, where he wrote, became to him a second Paradise, and his labor upon the sacred text so sweet as to afford him a foretaste of heaven. First he revised the Septuagint and then made a new translation of the whole Bible from the original, giving to the latter work eleven golden years, beginning it in 392 and finishing in 404, and subsequently, as old age, with poverty, bereavement, and infirmities, particularly failing sight, which made it difficult to distinguish Hebrew letters, settled down upon him, it was his delight to expound the text which he had corrected, while [87] he exulted that the Jews could no longer reproach the church for its corrupt readings, and looked away from the denunciations of his contemporaries to the gratitude of coming generations, with an assurance which time has amply justified. Martin Luther, himself a prince among translators of the Bible, while he recoiled with violent condemnation from Jerome's asceticism, affirmed that as a translator he excelled all others.

If Jerome, as a recent biographer[1] has said, lived and reigned 1000 years in the principles and usages of the mediæval church, Basil has a sure place in the gratitude of all generations of those who adore the deity of the Holy Spirit, and both Jerome and Basil deserve canonization not only in the Roman Catholic Church, but in the Church Catholic, in the broadest meaning of the term.

[1] W. H. Freemantle, Prolegomena to Jerome, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. vi.

LIST OF MEMBERS, 1908

Prof. Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr., Ph.D., 4410 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. David Henry Bauslin, D.D., Springfield, Ohio.
Prof. George Lincoln Burr, LL.D., Ithaca, N. Y.
Prof. James Carter, D.D., Lincoln University, Pa.
Rev. John Tyler Christian, D.D., LL.D., 1504 Spring St., Little Rock, Ark.
Prof. Francis Albert Christie, Meadville, Pa.
Rev. Edward Benson Coe, D.D., LL.D., 42 West 52d St., New York City.
Prof. Melanchthon Coover, D.D., Gettysburg, Pa.
Rev. Edward Tanjore Corwin, D.D., North Branch, N. J.
Pres. William Henry Steele Demarest, D.D., New Brunswick, N. J.
Prof. John De Witt, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, N. J.
Prof. Henry Elias Dosker, D.D., LL.D., 1709 First Street, Louisville, Ky.
Rev. John Benjamin Drury, D.D., 149 Church St., New York City.
Rev. Henry Otis Dwight, LL.D., Bible House, New York City.
Prof. John Lewis Ewell, D.D., 325 College St., Washington, D. C.
Prof. John Alfred Faulkner, D.D., Madison, N. J.
Rev. Henry Ferguson, D.D., Concord, New Hampshire.
Mr. Barr Ferree, 7 Warren St., New York City.
Prof. Nils Forsander, D.D., Rock Island, Ill.
Prof. Frank Hugh Foster, Ph.D., Olivet, Mich.

Prof. James Isaac Good, D.D., West Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Edmund Lyman Hood, Ph.D., Atlanta, Ga.
Prof. George Edwin Horr, D.D., Newton Centre, Mass.
Rev. Henry Woodward Hulbert, D.D., 78 Spring St., Portland, Maine.
Rev. George Anson Jackson, 53 Mount Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Prof. Samuel Macauley Jackson, D.D., LL.D., 692 West End Ave., New York City.
Prof. Henry Eyster Jacobs, D.D., LL.D., Mount Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Edward Payson Johnson, D.D., New Brunswick, N. J.
Rt. Rev. Frederick Joseph Kinsman, D.D., Wilmington, Delaware.
Prof. William Palmer Ladd, Middletown, Conn.
Mr. Henry Charles Lea, LL.D., 2000 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Chancellor Henry Mitchell MacCracken, D.D., LL.D., University Heights, New York City.
Prof. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Ph.D., D.D., 75 E. 81st St., New York City.
Prof. Edward Waite Miller, D.D., Auburn, N. Y.
Prof. Edwin Knox Mitchell, D.D., Hartford, Conn.
Rev. John Nicum, D.D., 46 Morris St., Rochester, N. Y.
Rev. George Norcross, D.D., Carlisle, Pa.
Rt. Rev. Dennis Joseph O'Connell, D.D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
Prof. Charles Gordon Paterson, San Anselmo, Cal.
Prof. Richard Clark Reed, D.D., 1419 Richland St., Columbia, S. C.
Prof. George Warren Richards, D.D., Lancaster, Pa.
Rev. James Forsyth Riggs, D.D., 56 Halsted St., East Orange, N. J.
Prof. William Walker Rockwell, Lic. Theol., 700 Park Ave., New York City.
Rev. James William Rogers, Walton, Ky.

Prof. Henry Kalloch Rowe, Ph.D., 83 Institution Ave., Newton Centre, Mass.

Rev. William Otis Ruston, D.D., 24 West Locust St., Dubuque, Iowa.

Mr. Julius Friedrich Sachse, Litt.D., 4428 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Prof. Hugh McDonald Scott, D.D., 520 Adams St., Chicago, Ill.

Prof. Allen Dudley Severance, 8821 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.

Prof. Henry Clay Sheldon, D.D., 383 Cherry St., West Newton, Mass.

Prof. Arley Barthlow Show, Stanford University, Cal.

Prof. Samuel Simpson, Ph. D., Tolland, Conn.

Prof. Adolph Spaeth, D.D., LL.D., 7300 Boyer St., Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.

Prof. George Frederick Spieker, D.D., Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. Joseph Ross Stevenson, D.D., 19 E. 66th St., New York City.

Prof. Charles Macaulay Stuart, D.D., Evanston, Ill.

Prof. Henry Clay Vedder, D.D., Chester, Pa.

Prof. Andrew George Voigt, D.D., Mt. Pleasant, S. C.

Prof. Williston Walker, Ph.D., D.D., 281 Edwards St., New Haven, Conn.

Prof. Henry Jacob Weber, Ph.D., Bloomfield, N. J.

DECEASED MEMBERS

Rev. Leonard Woolsey Bacon, M.D., D.D., died Assonet, Mass., May 12, 1907.

Rev. Gottlob Frederick Krotel, D.D., LL.D., died New York City, May 17, 1907.

Rev. Charles Comfort Tiffany, D.D., died Northeast Harbor, Me., Aug. 20, 1907.

Rev. Alexander Viets Griswold Allen, D.D., died Cambridge, Mass., July 1, 1908.

Rev. Abram Herbert Lewis, D.D., LL.D., died Westerly, R. I., Nov. 3, 1908.

The Letters of Einhard

Translated by Henry Preble

Annotated by Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr.

THE LETTERS OF EINHARD

Translated by Henry Preble, New York City. Annotated by Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

EINHARD was born about 770, in the Maingau, of noble parents. He was educated at Fulda and at the Court of Charles the Great, enjoying the instruction of Alcuin. Naturally he grew up in the service of the Court where, on account of his talent for mathematics and architecture, he filled a position which might be described as that of Minister of Public Works. He was not, as tradition makes him, the secretary of Charles, but was employed by him on several important diplomatic missions and was always among his most trusted and influential advisers. Under Ludwig the Pious, he served in the same capacities, and after his retirement from Court was on intimate terms with his sovereign. In addition to other estates, Einhard, although a layman, enjoyed several important abbeys, among them that of St. Bavon at Ghent. He was a married man and his wife, of whom two letters have been preserved (Epp. 37, 38), remained with him after he became what appears to have been an abbot.[1] The principal facts of the latter part of Einhard's life are connected with his Epistles and aid in determining their date. He suffered from a serious illness in 829, from

[1] Cf. *Cath. Encyc.* 1.17, col. 2; PRE[3]. 23 (1913), 371, 45–51.

the effects of which he never fully recovered. In 830 he left the Court of Ludwig the Pious in what seems like disgust, and retired to his estate at Obermühlheim, subsequently named Seligenstadt. This place he had acquired some years before, and here he had already begun buildings which became the nucleus of the abbey, the conventual buildings proper having been erected about 834. In 836 his wife Imma died and the Emperor Ludwig the Pious paid a visit of condolence to him at Seligenstadt. Although at that place from the middle of 830, Einhard as a great vassal had frequently to appear from time to time at the Court of the Emperor and his sons and he kept in touch with affairs and statesmen. But the troubled political condition of the country and the wretched disputes in the Imperial family depressed his closing years. He died in 840, about seventy years old.

Of the works of Einhard, the most important is his *Vita Karoli Magni*, written shortly after the death of that monarch. It is indicative of the writer's classical education and taste that it is closely modelled after the *Vita Augusti* of Suetonius. The so-called *Annales Einhardi* are probably not his work, but he made large use of them in his life of Charles. His *Historia Translationis SS. Marcellini et Petri* was written in honour of the saints whose relics were preserved at Seligenstadt. Einhard's Epistles have always been prized as throwing light upon the times. There are complete editions of the works of Einhard by Teulet, Paris, 1840-1843; and by Pertz in the *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*. There is a French translation of his works by Teulet, Paris, 1856, and English translations of the *Vita Caroli Magni* by W. Glaister, London, 1877, and by S. E. Turner (in Harper's Half-Hour Series), New York. The critical editions of the Epistles are those of Teulet, in his edition of the works, Jaffé in his *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*, IV, both, however, superseded by the edition of K. Hampe in *Mon. Germ. Hist. Epistolarum*, Tom. V (*Karolini aevi*, III), Berlin,

1899. On this edition is based the following translation. There is but one manuscript of the Epistles, now preserved at Paris but formerly at Laon. It belongs to the ninth century and was made either at Ghent before, or at Laon immediately after, the monks of St. Bavon were driven by the Norman to take refuge at Laon. In Teulet's edition the numbering is the same as in this manuscript. Both Teulet's and Jaffé's numbering are indicated under the title of each Epistle.

The following translation was made by Mr. Henry Preble at the instance of the late Dr. S. M. Jackson. Mr. Preble has also translated for Dr. Jackson the *Letters of Servatus Lupus*, for the first time into English, and it is hoped that the way may be open to publish also that translation either in Vol. IV or some subsequent volume of the *Papers of the American Society of Church History*. Considerations of space have compelled me to restrict the notes as much as possible. But it is to be hoped that enough is given to justify the chronological order, that of Hampe, and to explain a few difficulties. Epistles 1–41, it will be seen, can be dated fairly well, but Epistles 42–66 can not be assigned to any definite year and fall between 825 and 840, the period apparently covered by the collection. Epistles 67–71 do not belong to the original collection as neither from nor to Einhard.

JOSEPH CULLEN AYER, JR.

EPISTLES

Ep. 1. *Einhard to Ansgisus, Abbot of St. Wandrille.* (T. 1; J. 20.)

Einhard was abbot of St. Wandrille 816–823 and was succeeded by Ansgisus. This letter, the first in the codex, cannot be earlier than 823 and was probably written only a short time after Einhard surrendered the abbey, as it refers to the case of a man disturbed in his possession of property,

probably by the change of abbots. St. Wandrille, or Fontanelle, is on the Seine below Rouen.

To my dearly beloved brother in Christ, the revered Ansgisus, everlasting salvation in the Lord.

I beg your dearly beloved self to deign not to be annoyed but rather to regard it with kindness and good nature that in view of the needs of a man once a vassal of ours, now a vassal of my lord Lotha's, I appeal to you to suffer him to hold upon any terms that please you a benefice[1] which I gave him, until such time as I shall be able, with the Lord's help, to give him some compensation from another benefice through the generosity of my lords. You will find me all the more ready and eager to serve your wishes and profit if you deign to comply with my request in this matter. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 2. *Einhard to Bernharius, Bishop of Worms.* (T. 31; J. 4.)

Bernharius, died March 21, 826. He was also abbot of Weissenburg.

To the holy and deservedly venerated lord, Bishop N., Einhard wishes everlasting salvation in the Lord.

Though it saddens me very much to hear that you are in such a painful condition of body, beloved lord, yet I find no small consolation in the fact that I feel assured that this pain has profit for you and looks to the purging of the soul. For I believe that divine mercy is permitting you to suffer so long with this bodily disease that it may receive you perfected when departing from this body. As to offering prayers for you, let me tell your dear self that to the utmost strength and ability that God deigns to grant me, I will strive through those whom I think worthy to be heard, just as I see that you also have confidence in feeble me. Although we must never despair of recovering bodily health, since God is mighty to do whatever He will with His creatures, yet it is better for every one of us to make himself ready for what is certain than for an uncertainty to neglect what is necessary in

[1] *I. e.* property held on any form of feudal tenure.

a sort of hope for something better. I hope you will ever prosper in the Lord.

Ep. 3. *Bernharius, Bishop of Worms, to Einhard.* (T. 32; J. 3.)

To my dear friend Einhard, Bernharius, now in my last hours, yet faithful to you and yours while breath remains, as God is my witness.

To your affection, my beloved friend, I commend my soul when it has gone from its sin-bound body, that you may deign to have it admitted to association with you and your faithful ones, to the end that the poor soul, aided by earnest and holy prayers, and the petitions of pious brothers, may be privileged to receive some place of refreshment.

With this brief preface, then, because of the great and excessive straits of the flesh or spirit, I beg you, my beloved friend, by the love of God and your friendship for my unworthy self, to devote the utmost care to the churches entrusted to little me, that after my demise ravening wolves may not invade the holy place and scatter the lowly flock, but rather a guide may be given them who knows how to love or fear God, and to help in mercy those put under him.

Our most faithful brethren and yours of the monastery of N.[1] have chosen Folquicus[2] to preside over them, the one among them who is closest to me. He is young in years, indeed, but old, I think, in character. You know his pedigree well, a son of Na, brother of Ni, and related to many nobles. They have sent him to Worms, and commended him in person while I am still alive, during the visit he has deigned to pay me.[3] He promised emphatically and with many tears to me or my relatives, in the presence of Count N., and my lord N., forced by the prayers, agreed that if God so willed they should choose him for my place.[4]

[1] Weissenburg.

[2] The successor of Bernharius both at Weissenburg and in the bishopric of Worms.

[3] The syntax of the passage is mixed, and I have used N, *Na*, *Ni*, to distinguish the different persons given as *N.*—H. P.

[4] This obscure sentence appears to mean that Folquicus promised before witnesses that he would consent to accept the election, and that "my lord N." assented to the election.

Therefore, remember, sweet friend, that this is not to be postponed, but strive with all your power to have it done.

I send a pallium which I beg you to order given to the brothers at St. Servais,[1] as a remembrance of me. I have ordered that my mule be given to your dear self. Let my beloved sister Imma[2] help in these things. I commend my soul to thee. My distress does not allow me to say more, but again I commend my soul to your prayers.

Ep. 4. *Einhard to Amalhaire, a Presbyter of Metz.* (T. 3; J. 6.)

Amalhaire was sent by the Emperor Ludwig to Pope Gregory IV (827–844). He was the director of the Schola Palatina and composed several liturgical works; v. Migne, *Patrologia*, Ser. Lat., vol. 105.

To Amalhaire, most revered servant of Christ, Einhard, sinner.

Some one anticipated the arrival of the boy who brought me your letter, and caused that word be sent to you that you should come to the Emperor the day after Palm Sunday. But after I received your letter, and asked the Emperor about the matters you wished, he directed me to write to you to celebrate the holy day of Easter at home, and to order the remainder of your retinue to come after you in such fashion that when they had come to you at Court, and your orders had been received, and the scheme of your mission had been imparted to you, you could start upon your journey without delay. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 5. *Einhard to his Vidame at St. Servais at Maastricht.* (T. 23; J. 27.)

Probably addressed to Bonottus, mentioned in Ep. 52. A Vidame was a bishop's or abbot's secular representative.[3] The date may be before 830 as Einhard seems still to be

[1] Abbey at Maastricht which Einhard held as abbot.

[2] Wife of Einhard.

[3] See *Encyc. Brit.*, XI. Ed., *s. v.* Vidame.

connected with the Court at Aix. In 828 Ludwig was at Aix on St. Martin's, Nov. 11.

Abbot Einhard to our Vidame and trusty man, greeting in the name of Christ.

Be it known to you that we wish you to send some men to Aix to repair and restore our buildings, and to see to it that the things which we need to have there, that is meal, white corn, wine, cheese, and so forth, reach there at the proper time, as is usual. Furthermore we wish you to send to Lanaeken[1] the oxen that are to be slaughtered and have them slaughtered there. One of these we wish you to have given to Hruotlouge, and the bits and inwards that cannot be kept for our use we wish to have given to the household there. With the Lord's help we wish to reach the palace about the feast of St. Martin, if life attend us, and therefore we wish you to make all these things known even to the younger members, and to direct them in our name to do at our cost as we direct you to do. Fare you well.

Ep. 6. *Einhard to Geboin.* (T. 9; J. 30.)

The date is uncertain. Possibly the way in which Ludwig and Lothar are mentioned points to 830 or earlier.

Glorious Count Palatine.[2] Einhard sends greeting in the Lord.

I ask your beloved self to deign to hear this man of my country, David by name, who wishes to lay his troubles before you, and if you find his case a good one, procure him the opportunity to appeal to our lord the Emperor. For he is a vassal of my lord Lothar, and therefore not only because of my request but also out of regard and affection for his lord, you ought to help him. I hope I may have the good fortune to see you soon safe and sound.

Ep. 7. *Einhard to Hruotbert.* (T. 11; J. 31.)

[1] N. W. of Maastricht.

[2] *Comes Palatii*, whose duty it was to assist in the administration of justice: *cf.* Hincmar, *De Ordine Palatii*, c. 19.

Hruotbert may be the same person as the one to whom Epp. 21, 22 are addressed. He is otherwise unknown.

To the grand, honoured, and illustrious Hruotbert, glorious count, eternal salvation in the Lord.

I ask your kind self to deign to send me word what your pleasure is as to what ought to be done in regard to the case of my man Alafrid,—whether it is to be dismissed altogether, or whether he should still hope to come to his just deserts through your assistance. For I have informed my lord the Emperor of the whole case as it has been investigated by you through the testimony of truthful persons along with the Counts Palatine, Adalhard and Gebuin,[1] and he answered me that he was astonished that the case had not already been brought to an end. Therefore I pray your beloved self to deign to send me word now what my man aforesaid ought to do about his case. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 8. *Einhard to Count Poppo.* (T. 13; J. 55.)

The date may be indicated by the reference to Aix where Einhard was busy at Court until 830, living then principally at that place. The name of Count Poppo occurs in Fulda documents, 819–839. He was Count of Tullifeld.

To the grand, honoured, and illustrious Poppo, glorious count, Einhard wishes everlasting salvation in the Lord.

I have been told that you have asked that I inform you upon three points. It is indeed difficult for me to do so in regard to one of them, that is, whether a woman, whom you know better than I do, can without fault be taken in marriage by you. For as far as the dispensation[2] which you received at Aixis concerned, I want no other compensation than your friendship.[2] As to Jupille,[3] I am ready to do according to what was agreed upon between us when we spoke together upon the subject, and therefore I cannot give you any further information now by letter. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

[1] *Cf.* Ep. 6; Gebuin and Geboin appear to be the same person.

[2] Nature wholly uncertain.

[3] Near Liège, on the Meuse.

Ep. 9. *Einhard to his Vidame at Fritzlar.* (T. 37; J. 45.)

Einhard is spending the winter at Aix, but is concerned with his affairs at Seligenstadt. This would indicate a date between 828 and 830.

Einhard in Christ's name to his Vidame, N.

I am very much astonished that all the things which I entrusted to you to do have been left as they have been left. For I hear that of the grain which you were to send to Mühlheim[1] to make meal or flour, you have sent none, nor any thing else except thirty swine, and those not fine ones but mediocre, as well as three pecks of vegetables,—of the rest nothing.

And not only this but also in this whole winter I have seen nothing either of you or of any one sent by you who could give me any report about those parts. If I am to derive no greater benefit from Fritzlar[2] than you have brought me, I do not know why I should hold that benefice. Now, therefore, if you care any thing about my favour, I ask you to make a vigorous effort to correct your negligence, and inform me speedily what I have a right to expect of you.

Ep. 10. *Einhard to the Emperor Ludwig.* (T. 71; J. 14.)

Einhard obtained from the Emperor Ludwig the estate of Obermülheim, or Mulinheim, and erected some houses and a church. While debating the selection of a saint to whom to dedicate the church, he heard of the many relics to be obtained in Rome. To Soissons had recently been brought relics of St. Sebastian and very many miracles were reported of them. Accordingly Einhard sent to Rome, where after some difficulty his envoys, having fasted three days and fortified themselves with many prayers and invocation of God, plundered the tombs of St. Marcellinus and St. Peter in the Church of St. Peter in Chains, and escaped from Rome undetected. For a highly naïve account, see Einhard's *Historia Translationis SS. Marcellini et Petri.*

[1] Afterwards called *Seligenstadt.* [2] In Hesse, 16 miles S. W. of Cassel.

Although I confidently believe that my most pious lord is ever mindful of his patron saints, Christ's blessed martyrs, Marcellinus and Peter, who by God's secret decree left Rome, and came to France to exalt and protect your kingdom,[1] and for some reason deigned to accept hospitality with me, a sinner, yet a great necessity lies upon me to remind you frequently of the things that pertain to their honour, lest perchance I incur danger and detriment to my soul if I stand forth less attentive than I ought to be to their admonitions, and, although they are most merciful, having even spared their slayer, yet I fear to offend their king, our Lord Jesus Christ, for love of whom they did not hesitate to die, if he should find me slothful in showing forth the honours which are appropriate to their service.

Accordingly, most pious lord, I humbly admonish your excellency, and beg you to deign to remember that exchange as to the place in which the reverend bodies of the martyrs rest which was made with Bishop Otgar,[2] and to make the place definitively theirs for the freeing of which you handed over of your own property to St. Martin.[3]

Likewise I presume to remind your merciful self of my prayers in which, at the time when I was enfeebled and in fear of the approach of death,[4] I suggested to you that you should deign to give to your same most gentle patron saints something from your benefices for the support of those who are to serve God at the resting place of the most sacred bodies of the holy martyrs, according to the hope you gave me then by your most kind promises, for I ought not to be deceived in my desire, and not only for this reason but because you ought to visit your mercy upon those whom I have reared for your service, and assist them from these benefices. I trust most confidently that in this you must win the favour of God and His saints, if you deign to cause me to accomplish my wishes in this matter.

[1] The relics were first deposited at Michelstadt in 827 but removed to Obermühlheim in consequence of revelations made to Einhard.

[2] Archbishop of Mainz, 826–847.

[3] The cathedral church of Mainz was dedicated to St. Martin. His equestrian statue still stands on the roof of the choir.

[4] Reference probably to the serious illness of 829 which Einhard mentions in several epistles.

I likewise ask you to deign to reflect and consider what reward awaits you with God, and how your fame will grow in this world if through you and in your time the place of the rest of the holy martyrs shall be so equipped and increased and adorned with both buildings and the other things essential that even its construction shall be attributed to your name, and your memory and that of the martyrs shall be celebrated together in the mouths of all nations for ever.

And finally I ask and earnestly beg your great Clemency to deign to look with loving pity upon miserable and sinful me now in my old age and great infirmity, and to cause me to be freed and exempted from secular cares, and to allow me in peace and tranquillity to live beside the tombs of Christ's blessed martyrs, who are your patron saints also, under your protection and in obedience to these same saints and in the service of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, so that that inevitable and final day, which is apt to come upon the age at which I have now arrived, may find me not busied with vain and transitory cares but rather free to pray and read, and devoting my thoughts to meditation upon the divine law.

Ep. 11. *Einhard to the Emperor Lothar.* (T. 34; J. 7.)

The tone of this letter is in striking contrast to other letters to Lothar (*cf.* Ep. 16, init.). If it is actually the composition of Einhard, it was probably written at the request of Ludwig or the Court party and does not represent the sentiments of the writer. If it was not by Einhard, it is difficult to see how it came among his letters. Lothar had been crowned Emperor by his father at Aix in 817 and again by Pope Paschal at Rome in 823. His return from Italy, after his consent to the partition agreement of 829, was distinctly hostile. The date is 830.

My lord, the most pious Emperor, live forever! How much care and anxiety my humble self feels for your Imperial Majesty I cannot easily express in words. For I have ever loved you as I have loved my most pious lord, your father, and I have wished for the safety of both alike ever since, with the approval of all

his people, he made you the associate of his name and kingdom, and commanded little me to devote my care to you and be your constant mentor, in moulding your character and encouraging the pursuit of what was right and profitable. And although you have found my labours in these matters less profitable than they ought to have been, yet my faithful intention has not failed, and does not fail now, so that it will not suffer me to be silent, but rather forces me to admonish you in regard to your salvation, and briefly to set forth the things in which you ought to guard against danger to yourself.

Your Imperial Majesty should know that it has come to the notice of my humble self that certain persons, seeking their own advantage rather than yours, are working upon your gentle disposition and trying to persuade you to neglect your father's advice, and abandon the obedience due him, by leaving the post committed to your keeping and management by your most pious father, and coming to him against his will and desires and without his orders, and remaining with him although that is not pleasing to him. What can be imagined more wrong-headed and unseemly? See what the character of such effort to persuade you is, and how much evil it contains. For in the first place, as it seems to my humble self, it encourages you to hold of small account God's command which bids that honour be shown to parents, and to count as nothing the length of days which is promised as the reward for keeping that commandment; furthermore, to cast aside obedience, and take upon yourself disobedience instead, and to rise in contumacious arrogance against him towards whom you ought to have shown yourself humbly submissive; more than this, to drive away affection through contemptuous disobedience, and to allow a want of harmony, which never ought to find even mention between you, to grow to such an extent that hate is arising between those between whom there should be love. This ought most vigorously to be guarded against. For I think your Wisdom is well aware what an abomination before God a son is who is contumacious and disobedient to his parents, since, as you can read in Deuteronomy, God commanded through Moses that such a one be stoned by all the people. Therefore I have thought that your pious self ought to be admonished to use the wisdom given you by God and guard

against danger to yourself, and not think that this divine utterance can be scorned by any one whatever, written though it be in the old law. For it is one of many which, as our elders and teachers, the holy fathers, have held, are to be observed in present times as well as past, in Christian times as well as Jewish. I love you, God knows, and therefore I admonish you thus faithfully, and you ought to consider not the worthlessness of the person who admonishes but the soundness of the advice. I hope. . .[1]

Ep. 12. *The Emperor Ludwig to the People of Merida in Spain.* (T. 39; J. 5.)

The inhabitants of Merida on the Guadiana were in revolt against Abdiraman. As Ludwig was at war with that monarch, the revolt, if encouraged, might be useful as causing a diversion of forces from the Spanish March. Ludwig therefore sought to bring about an alliance with the people of Merida. Revolts took place at Toledo in 829–838 and possibly that at Merida was a part of a widespread uprising. The date of the letter appears to be early in 830 when Einhard was still at Court and writing for the Emperor. The omission of the name of Lothar as co-emperor is sufficiently explained by the strained relation existing between the father and son, indicated in Ep. 11.

In the name of the Lord God and of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, N. [*i.e.* Ludwig], by ordinance of divine providence August Emperor, to all the nobles and all the people of Merida, greeting in the Lord.

We have heard of your tribulation and of the various woes you are suffering through the cruelty of King Abdiraman, who through excessive greed for your property which he has tried to take from you has often visited you with violence and oppression. As also we find his father Abolaz[2] did, who by unjust extortions forced you to pay him sums which you did not owe, and thereby made of friends enemies and of obedient vassals insubordinate

[1] The conclusion wanting in the manuscript.

[2] Al Hakem I, emir of Cordova, 796–822.

and disobedient ones. For he plotted to take away your freedom also, and to burden and humble you with unjust taxes and tribute. But, as we have heard, you have always valiantly resisted like brave men the wrongs put upon you by wicked kings, and have manfully withstood their cruelty and greed. This we have learned from many reports you are also now doing.

Therefore we have been pleased to address this letter to you, and to comfort you, and urge you to continue as you have begun in defending your freedom against a bitterly cruel king, and to scorn, as you have done hitherto, all yielding to his fierceness and fury. And since this same king is most certainly as much our adversary and enemy as he is yours, let us fight with common purpose against his ferocity.

For we desire with the help of Almighty God to send our army this coming summer to our borders to encamp there ready and waiting until you send word that it ought to advance, if so it seems good to you, that we should direct this same army, with a view to helping you against our common enemies who are dwelling in our borders, to the end that if Abdiraman or his army wishes to march against you, they may be prevented by our army from being able to march against you in support of him and his army.

For we will say to you that if you are willing to turn away from him and to turn to us, we will allow you to enjoy your old-time freedom fully and without any diminution, and will permit you to be exempt from tax or tribute and will not order you to observe any other law than that under which you desire to live, nor do we desire to treat you in any other way than to regard you honourably as friends and allies in the defence of our realm. We hope that you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 13. *Einhard to the Empress Judith.*[1] (T. 40; J. 8.)

The Emperor left Aix March 2, 830, on an expedition to Brittany, but was delayed by the opposition of the nobility and others. At Compiègne, whither the Empress Judith was on her way to meet him, the Emperor learned of the rebellion of his sons. Einhard was at Valenciennes on his

[1] Judith, second wife of Ludwig the Pious, married 819.

way to the Empress when he wrote this letter. See also Ep. 14.

May my most pious lady deign to learn that I, your servant, have been afflicted with such bodily ills since I came away from Aix that I could hardly get from Maastricht to Valenciennes in ten days. There so violent a pain in my kidneys and also in the spleen attacked me that I could not accomplish even one mile on horseback in a whole day.

Therefore I beseech that your pious self will allow me by your grace to go by water to St. N. [*i. e.* St. Bavon], and to rest there until Almighty God shall deign to give me strength to make the journey. For as soon as I can ride, I will hurry to you or to my lord the Emperor as it shall please you that I do. Now I humbly pray that your pious self will deign to excuse me to my most merciful lord, when you come to him, for my not having come to you. God is my witness that I write you no untruth in regard to my health, and not only that but also there are also certain other ills much more serious which I am suffering, about which I cannot speak except to an intimate friend.

Yet know this, that you cannot acquire a greater reward at this time before God than if you bring it about that I be permitted to hasten as soon as I am well enough to the service of Christ's holy martyrs. For I can get there by water in fifteen days from St. N.

Ep. 14. *Einhard to a Friend.* (T. 41; J. 9.)

The date and circumstances of this letter are shown by its connection with the preceding.

If my feebleness of body did not prevent, I should not be sending this letter but rather coming myself to be with you in these events that are taking place with you. Now being in great straits I beg your kind self to deign to intercede for me with our most pious lord and Emperor. For the Queen ordered me when she went away from Aix, and I could not go with her, to come after her to Compiègne. Obeying her commands I hardly got as far as Valenciennes with great diffi-

culty in ten days. Thence, because I was not strong enough to ride, I went by water to St. N. [*i. e.* St. Bavon]. For an excessive looseness of the bowels and a pain in the kidneys so followed each other alternately in me that there was not a day after I started from Aix that I did not suffer from one or the other trouble. There are likewise other ills which came from that sickness with which I was laid up last year, namely, a constant numbness of the right thigh and an almost unendurable pain in the spleen. Afflicted with these sufferings I am passing a very sad life with almost nothing cheerful in it, especially because I am afraid that I shall die in a place other than I should wish and engaged in other occupation than serving Christ's holy martyrs.

Therefore I adjure and beseech you by Christ's blessed martyrs Marcellinus and Peter to deign to intercede for my humble self with the most pious Emperor, so that he may not be angry with me because I did not come to meet him as did those who could. I should surely have come if I had been able, and I shall come as soon as I am able, and whether absent or present I shall remain ever faithful to him. I pray your kind self, therefore, to deign to inform me by letter as speedily as you can about what has taken place and what is to take place with you. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Everything that is now happening in this realm was predicted two years ago from the revelations of Christ's martyrs.[1]

Ep. 15. *Einhard to the Emperor Ludwig.* (T. 42; J. 10.)

This letter belongs to the spring of 830, probably to April, and was written from St. Bavon in Ghent.

To a great lord, an ordinary servant.

[I hope] my most pious lord remembers how you gave me permission to betake myself to the service of Christ's blessed martyrs when my lady went to you. This I desired to do, but my lady bade me to come after her to Compiègne, and in obedi-

[1] *Cf. Hist. Translationis SS. Marcellini et Petri*, V. 47. The angel Gabriel had taken the form of St. Marcellinus and appeared to a blind man giving him a revelation as to the affairs of the kingdom The blind man went to Einhard who reduced the revelation to writing and presented it to the Emperor.

ence to her orders I started to go to Compiègne after her as soon as I could get my horses. On setting out I was seized with a pain in the spleen and also the kidneys, and was so ill that I hardly reached Valenciennes from Maastricht in ten days. Seeing there that I could not ride and having found a boat, I came on the next day to St. N. [*i. e.* St. Bavon] by water, and now lying here in great pain and distress I beg and beseech your pious self to give me permission to proceed to the place in which the sacred bodies of your pious patron saints rest. For I can get there from St. Bavon in fifteen days by water. You can win a great reward for yourself before God, if you allow me to go to the service of His saints, if indeed I shall be able to reach there alive. I believe that those holy martyrs must intercede for you before God if you will set their service before service to yourself. For in no other place in your realm can I do you greater good than there if you will help me in the matter.

Ep. 16. *Einhard to a Bishop.* (T. 43; J. 11.)

This letter reveals the real feelings of Einhard toward Lothar. It was written May 1, 830, when Lothar had just returned from Italy in rebellion against his father.

To the holy and deservedly revered lord, the most reverend Bishop N., Einhard, sinner.

I cease not to give the heartiest thanks I can to God Almighty and our Lord Jesus Christ, since I have learned that my glorious and God-preserved and ever-to-be-preserved lord, the Emperor Lothar, has come safe and sound from Italy, and you, my very dear friend, with him, and I hope and pray that he will speedily allow me to come where I may enjoy your bodily presence. Yet meanwhile I commend my humble self to your Christian love and through you to his piety, and beg that you will not allow yourselves to entertain any sinister suspicion of my humble self because of anybody's suggestions. I call God and the holy martyrs Marcellinus and Peter to witness that I cannot find words to express the love and devotion which I am conscious of feeling towards you. And therefore I ask with confidence that when I come I may find you disposed to me as I feel sure that I

have deserved of you. I hope that your Holiness[1] will ever flourish in Christ, and not forget my feeble self.

Ep. 17. *Einhard to a certain E.* (T. 44; J. 13.)
The date is apparently between May and September, 830.

To the holy and deservedly revered lord, E., Einhard wishes eternal salvation.

Although there are very many things about which I should like to know, yet there are two about which my desire for information is strongest just now. One is, where and when this general assembly[2] is to be held; the other, whether my lord Lothar is to return to Italy, or to remain with his father. Let your kind self not disdain to inform me on these two points, for I need to know these more than the other things going on with you. For on them depends what I ought to do, if the divine mercy shall deign to look with favour upon me and enable me to be of any use. I hope soon to see you in flourishing condition, best beloved of my friends.

Ep. 18. *Einhard to Count G.* (T. 45; J. 12.)
When this letter was written, Einhard's removal from Court was a recently accomplished fact. Lothar was still with the Emperor Ludwig. The date may therefore be placed toward the end of 830. It is interesting to note that Einhard's warm friends are good friends of his former pupil Lothar; *cf.* Ep. 16.

To his beloved brother G.,[3] glorious, noble and count, Einhard wishes everlasting salvation in the Lord.

I have ever felt your kindly affection for me, but never more than now, when you have obtained for me permission to proceed to the service of Saints Marcellinus and Peter, who on account of this deed will be sure to intercede with God. Therefore I

[1] A term at that time not customarily restricted to the Pope.

[2] The assembly at Nimwegen, Oct. 830, at which Ludwig was restored by his sons, Pippin and Ludwig, who were jealous of the power of Lothar.

[3] Possibly Geboin; *v.* Epp. 6, 7, 14.

thank your kind self as heartily as I know how, and earnestly beg that in accordance with your kind custom you will deign ever to speak for me both with my lord the Emperor and with his sons, especially my lord, Emperor Lothar, in whose pious devotion I have great confidence, unworthy as I am.

For the rest, I ask you to be good enough to reward the painter N., your devoted servant, and help him, and deign to intercede for him with my lord the Emperor, if you see a favourable opportunity, that he may not through any one's hostility lose his benefice which he won by serving his lord's will. It is not necessary for me to name to you those whom he fears in this matter, for they are as well known to you as to me. I only ask you to deign to help him as far as you can. I hope you may ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 19. *Einhard to a Noble Friend.* (T. 149; J. 49.)

Date uncertain, but placed in this connection as evidently referring to Lothar as still with his father. It may belong to the winter of 830–831.

To his beloved brother and faithful friend, N., glorious noble, Einhard wishes eternal salvation in the Lord.

Because I have such well founded confidence in you that I can no way hesitate to run for help to your kindness in all emergencies of my own and my friends, I am now sending you with this letter my fellow-countrymen and friends, Aristeus and Theothous, begging that you will deign to receive them in your usual friendly way, and in their needs which they will impart to you to help them with my lord, Emperor Lothar, and his most pious father, so that they shall have the same great confidence in you that I have. I hope you may ever flourish, best and dearest of friends.

Ep. 20. *Emperor Ludwig to Count G.* (T. 19; J. 26.)

This and the following two letters appear to have been written at nearly the same time, about November, 832.

Ludwig, by ordination of Divine Providence August Emperor to Count G. in the name of the Lord God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Be it known to you that we wish you, when this letter of ours reaches you, to prepare immediately without any delay to go to meet our *Missus*, H, at our city of Heilbronn on the eighteenth of December, that is a week before Christmas, and what he shall enjoin upon you in our name to do along with our other faithful counts and vassals, to do it zealously and conduct yourself therein according to the confidence we have in your faithfulness. Fare you well.

Ep. 21. *Emperor Ludwig to his Vassal H.* (T. 20; J. 32.)

To his faithful H., in the name of the Emperor Ludwig, by ordination of Divine Providence August Emperor, to our faithful H., in the name of the Lord God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Be it known to you that we wish you to bid that one of your sons, our vassals, who you know can best do it, be ready, when Count R. and our *Missus* H. desire to send us any word by him, to proceed without delay or lack of speed to Tours; there he will find, the Lord willing, either ourself or our beloved spouse. See that you show no negligence therein if you desire to hold our favour. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 22. *Emperor Ludwig to his Vassal T.* (T. 21; J. 33.)

Ludwig, by ordination of Divine Providence August Emperor, to our faithful T., in the name of the Lord God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Be it known to you that we wish you to prepare yourself, whenever Count Hrt.[1] and our *Missus* H. desire to send us any word by you, to be able to proceed with that message to Tours without delay or any lack of speed: there you will find, God willing, either ourself or our beloved spouse. See that you show no negligence therein if you desire to hold our favour.

Ep. 23. *Einhard to the Imperial Missus A.* (T. 22; J. 18.)

To his beloved brother and friend, Lord *Missus* A., Einhard wishes everlasting Salvation in the Lord.

[1] Possibly Hruotbert, *cf.* Ep. 7.

I thought it was well known to you that our men[1] whom we have in those parts were according to the ordinance and command of our lord the Emperor on coast-guard duty[2] not only at the time when he went to Tribur, but also when he kept on to Orleans.[3] And therefore it does not seem to me just that men should have to pay the heerban[4] who were nowhere except where the Emperor himself had commanded. And therefore I pray your beloved self to grant us a postponement until our lord the Emperor comes, and we will remind him of his command, and then he can give such orders as please him. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 24. *Einhard to Egilolf and Hunbert.* (T. 22; J. 18.)

As Hunbert was elected bishop of Würzburg soon after the death of Wolfgar, the date of this epistle can not be long after the death of the latter, Nov. 12, 832.

To the beloved brethren in Christ and devoted servants of Christ, Egilolf and Hunbert, eternal salvation in the Lord.

I know that you are aware that Bishop Wolfgar of blessed memory bestowed at my request a benefice of three manses and twelve serfs from the domain of St. Kilian,[5] in the district of Dubargau, in a place called Mergentheim, upon our man Gerbert. But in as much as he could remain in the enjoyment thereof only so long as the bishop still lived in the body, I pray your kind selves to allow the said Gerbert to hold that benefice, as he has done, until a bishop shall have been ordained in that See and it shall have been agreed between him and me what should be done in regard to the benefice in the future. I hope that you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 25. *Einhard to Ludwig II, German King.* (T. 53; J. 19.)

[1] Probably men belonging to the monastery of St. Bavon at Ghent.
[2] Norman pirates always threatened the northern coast.
[3] September, 832. This places the date of letter in latter part of year.
[4] Fine for not appearing when summoned.
[5] In Würzburg.

The date is determined by the reference to the division of the Empire, 833.

[I pray the clemency[1]] of my lord and most glorious King, that you will not be angry against me because I neither . . . nor afterwards came into your presence. For I did this out of no lack of respect for you nor from slothfulness, but because I was ill and suffering from fever, as I am still doing. And I hardly succeeded in coming into the presence of my lord Lothar, your brother, and, having received permission from him, of returning to the holy martyrs, when he also was allowed to depart from you two.

And my returning home was for no other reason than that though a division of the kingdom had been made among you[2] such as was made, I did not know it. For the report had come that the part of the eastern districts of France in which I am sojourning and have a small benefice was to belong to the kingdom of my lord Lothar. Hence I earnestly beg your Clemency to permit me to hold and enjoy the benefice[3] until I receive permission from my lord Lothar to come to you and put myself into your hands,—if I shall succeed in attaining this. For it is my purpose to come faithfully and devotedly into your service, if God shall deign to grant me life and health.

Ep. 26. *Einhard to a Presbyter and to his Vidame.* (T. 54; J. 21.)

The letter appears to be connected in time and circumstances with the preceding. Einhard seeks to insure his position as to both Lothar and Ludwig. The letter is probably addressed to Liuthard and Erembert; *cf.* Epp. 55 and 56.

In the name of Christ, Einhard, Abbot, to N., Presbyter, and N., Vidame, our trusty men, greeting in the Lord.

[1] Conjecturally supplied by K. Hampe, editor of text in M. G. H.

[2] Made at the Field of Lies, June 30, 833.

[3] According to the law of 806, made by Charles when the first division of the Empire was proposed, subjects of one ruler might not hold a benefice from the ruler of another division.

Be it known to you that we desire you to cause presents to be prepared according to custom, for the service of my lord Lothar and of N.,[1] his spouse, as is usual for a man to make for the service of his lord. And when Lothar returns from Orville to Compiègne, we desire that they be presented there, and afterwards we desire that you will send us word briefly how they were received by him or by her. Fare ye well.

Ep. 27. *Einhard to a Certain U.* (T. 26; J. 1.)

This and the following epistle seem to belong together and refer to the same case. The two letters may be dated at the earliest toward the end of 833.

Einhard to his U. everlasting salvation.

Frumold, son of Count N., whose sister N(a) has to wife, has a rather small benefice in Burgundy, in the Geneva region, where his father was count, but he is suffering from infirmity rather than old age, being troubled with a chronic case of severe gout, and is afraid that he will lose the benefice unless you kindly come to his aid, because in consequence of the infirmity that weighs upon him he cannot appear at Court. He therefore prays that in this emergency you will deign to ask our lord the Emperor to permit him to hold the benefice which the Emperor's grandfather granted him, and his father permitted him to hold, till such time as, having recovered his strength, he can appear before him and commend himself in the regular way. Your feeble, old comrade wishes you all prosperity, best beloved of comrades.

Ep. 28. *Einhard to a Count.* (T. 27; J. 2.)

To the grand, honoured, and illustrious N., glorious count, Einhard wishes everlasting salvation in the Lord.

N.,[2] an imperial vassal, brother of Count N(a)'s wife, wished to appear before our lord the Emperor, but being weighed down by gout and old age was unable to do so in consequence of his

[1] Irmingarde.

[2] This N. represents "Frumold" of Ep. 27; N(a) is used for another person, indicated in text by N.

infirmity. As soon as he is able, he will come to render service to him. Meanwhile he asks that he be allowed to hold the benefice which our lord the Emperor Charles gave him in Burgundy, in the Geneva district, until such time as he can appear before the Emperor and put himself in his hands. To me also it seems proper and expedient that what he desires be done, because he is a good and discreet man and of good repute among his neighbours, and you will do well if you deign to help him in this matter. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 29. *Einhard to a Certain Count.* (T. 28; J. 35.)

The subject matter of this letter is connected with the confusion in property rights arising from the division of the Empire; see note to Ep. 25.

To the grand, honoured, and illustrious N., glorious count, Einhard wishes eternal salvation in the Lord.

I ask your kind self to deign to help this young man, N., with our lord the Emperor, that he and his brother may not lose a benefice which they hold. For they have fifteen manses in the Tournai district and five beyond the Rhine.[1] He wishes to serve our lord the Emperor with the benefice which is in the Tournai country, and to have his brother put himself in N's hands with the benefice beyond the Rhine, yet so that they shall hold the entire benefice in common. But the brother does not want to agree to this unless commanded by our lord the Emperor. For unless this is done, they lose the benefice beyond the Rhine. Therefore he prays your good self to deign to ask our lord the Emperor to order his brother to do so, and he is ready to sign such compact as pleases our lord the Emperor that he means to hold his benefice always in common with his brother. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 30. *Einhard to a Bishop.* (T. 48; J. 34.)

Similar political situation. Bavaria had fallen to the share of Ludwig II. Date therefore toward the end of 833.

[1] Tournai was under Lothar; the country beyond the Rhine, under Ludwig II.

To the holy and deservedly revered lord, most reverend N., Einhard, sinner.

This presbyter, N. by name, has asked me very urgently to intercede with you for him, to the end that you will deign to deal mercifully towards him. He is, as he declares, in a situation of great poverty, especially now when the little benefice[1] that he held in Bavaria has been taken away from him and given to another. Thus he does not know what he is to do now or how to serve his overlord, unless through your intercession my lord Lothar will deign to give him some sort of indemnification to support him. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord, not forgetting me, but deigning to commend my humble self to the most pious Emperor.

Ep. 31. *Einhard to a Priest.* (T. 29; J. 15.)

This and the following epistle refer to the same person and conditions. Date probably about the end of 833.

To the holy and deservedly venerated lord, N., priest of the Most High God, Einhard, sinner.

We were very glad to have your relative and trusty man Eburon come to us, and thought he was to stay some time with us, but since he is in a hurry to return to you, we have not wished to let him go without a letter from us, lest if he return empty-handed he may be thought not to have come to us at all. In regard to the matters, however, about which he thought he should have something definite to take to you, I cannot send you anything definite or give indication through him because the change in things which has recently taken place in this realm has thrown us into such a state of confusion that we do not in the least know what we ought to do, except, according to the words of Jehoshaphat, to turn our eyes unto the Lord, and, in Philo's words, to pray for divine help since human fails. But Eburon, the bearer of these presents, though he is your own very dear relative, we venture to commend to your acceptance. For we trust in God that, though it were impossible now, we shall have the right at some other, more favourable time to send him back to you in glad

[1] Here as elsewhere a secular fief although in this case held by a clergyman.

and cheerful spirits with the help of the divine mercy. We hope that the divine grace will always and everywhere keep your Holiness in good health, and that you will not forget us.

Ep. 32. *Einhard to an Abbot.* (T. 35: J. 16.)

To the holy and deservedly revered N., most reverend abbot, N. [*i.e.* Einhard], sinner.

I have learned from what my friends say that N. (I do not know whether I ought to call him abbot or bishop, but you know perfectly well who he is) has the habit of asking your sound and most wise advice in matters having to do with his advantage. Therefore it has seemed well to me to beg your Holiness to deign to speak to the said man in behalf of his nephew Eburo now sojourning with me, and ask him not to deceive him in the hope he gave him, but rather to continue the kindness to him which he promised him. And that was to deign to help him in his straitened circumstances from his own resources, in order that he may not, in consequence of lack of money and need of essential things, experience the necessity of giving up the place in which he himself put him. And this will certainly happen unless he takes measures beforehand to prevent its happening. This provision can easily be made if he is willing to abide by the promises by which he drove him to do as he wished. I hope your Holiness, remembering my humble self, will ever flourish in Christ the Lord.

Ep. 33. *Einhard to Ludwig II.* (T. 51; J. 51.)

Epp. 33, 35, and 36 belong to the same period and concern the same topic, the building of the basilica at Seligenstadt. Portions of the building are still preserved in the abbey church. Ludwig II became King of the East Franks June, 833. The letters appear to have been written shortly after his accession.

My lord, your most pious father, ordered N. . . . from the monastery of N. to aid and coöperate with us in the building of the basilica of Christ's blessed martyrs Marcellinus and Peter, your patron saints. But it seems to me that they are not likely

to do anything about that work unless an order from your merciful Majesty comes to them bidding them again to help us in the aforesaid work according to the directions of my lord your father. Therefore, in order to make known to you the reason for the said work, I have taken pains to send to your high Majesty this letter of supplication from my humble self, by which I would ask and humbly petition that for the love and honour of Christ's martyrs, your patron saints, you will deign to give attention to the building of their basilica, that this thing may be accomplished through your help, and that you will give us for the bishop aforesaid your sacred command by a letter from your glorious authoritative hand which they shall not venture to disregard. Thus will your reward increase with God and the blessed martyrs will intercede for you, that your kingdom may ever be increased and strengthened, and stand safe and protected from the plots and hostile attacks of evil spirits and malicious men. I hope and pray that my lord the King may flourish and live for ever.

Ep. 34. *Einhard to Ludwig II.* (T. 52; J. 52.)
Possibly of the year 833.

I want to appeal to your pious self in behalf of an intimate friend of mine, N., to wit, your faithful subject, that you may deign to receive him, and when he has commended himself to your protection give him some consolation from the benefices which are known to be open and free here in our neighbourhood. For he is a noble, and faithful, and well trained for good service in any kind of duty that may be entrusted to him. For he served your grandfather and your father faithfully and energetically, and is ready to do the same by you if God wills to grant him life and health. He is pretty ill now, and therefore cannot come to your pious self in person, but will come as soon as he is able. Accordingly I pray your pious self to permit me to know what I may promise him from your goodness, that he may live in good hopes until he can come to you in person.

Ep. 35. *Einhard to a Certain F.* (T. 47; J. 50.)
Reference to the distracted condition of the Court suggests the autumn of 834 as date.

Einhard to F., everlasting salvation.

I do not ask you to write me anything about the state of things at Court, because there is nothing pleasant to hear about what is going on there. About you and my other friends, if with the exception of yourself any remain, I am very anxious to know where you are and what is happening with you. Therefore I have taken pains to send this letter to your good self that I may thus remind you to write to me how things are with you, that is, how you are and where and when there is possibility of our seeing each other if life attend us. For I have often longed to see you and talk with you, but never more ardently than now, because I have never felt a greater need of conferring about, and discussing with a friend, the regulation of my life, and that I do with no one more gladly than with you, for in none have I greater confidence.

I am sending a letter by this boy to Abbot N., and I will ask you to see that he is escorted thither by some one of your people if he can go on, or if by chance he cannot go farther because the beasts are tired out as is apt to be the case, I beg that you will receive from him the letter I am sending to Foulque,[1] and will send it to him by somebody, and beg him to answer me, and send back to you the answer he may be pleased to make. And will you please see that the answer comes to me as soon as you find a suitable bearer? I hope that you ever flourish in Christ, best beloved of my friends, and remember me.

Ep. 36. *Einhard to an Abbot.* (T. 46; J. 46.)

It is probable that this is the letter to Foulque mentioned in the preceding letter. If so, the date must be the same, *i. e.* the latter part of 834.

To the very reverend Abbot N., worthy of the deepest veneration, Einhard, sinner.

As I remember my request so I fancy you have not forgotten your promise, although many different obstacles afterwards arose, which might well not only have left that conversation of ours in abeyance for the time being but even have consigned it to lasting oblivion. I mean the conversation in which, being both on duty

[1] Folco, abbot of S. Wandrille, or Fontanelle, 834–845

at the Court, we spoke of the roof of the basilica of Christ's blessed martyrs Marcellinus and Peter, which I am now striving to construct, albeit with great difficulty, and it was agreed between us to buy lead for the price of fifty pounds. Now, although the work in the basilica has not yet reached the point that necessity compels me to remind you of the roofing, yet in view of the uncertain bounds of mortal life it always seems best to hasten to complete with the Lord's help the good work we have begun. Accordingly I beg your kind self to deign to inform me by letter about the purchase of this same lead, that I may know whether any beginning has been made yet, and, if none has yet been made, in what way the business is to be begun and with the Lord's help completed. Therefore I ask your very kind self not to disdain to inform me about this matter by letter. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord, and remember me.

Ep. 37. *Imma to Blidthrut.* (T. 15; J. 40.)

The date of this letter is partly determined by the fact that Imma, the wife of Einhard, died in 836. The marriage of an unfree man with a free woman, although forbidden by the various Germanic codes, was not null. If contracted the woman followed the condition of the man who for his part paid a fine, or *maritagium*, to his lord for marrying without his consent.

To her dearly-beloved sister Blidthrut, your friend and well-wisher Imma wishes eternal salvation in the Lord.

A serf of yours from Mosbach, Wenilo by name, has taken a certain free woman to himself in marriage, and now, in fear of your anger and that of his lord Albuin, has sought refuge at the shrine of Saints Marcellinus and Peter. I beg your charitable heart to deign to intercede with Albuin in my name for the man so that he may, with his favour and yours keep the woman he has taken to wife. I hope you will ever flourish.

Ep. 38. *Imma to N.* (T. 57; J. 65.)

The reading *avia* [grandmother] is a little uncertain owing to condition of manuscript.

To her revered and beloved lord and son N., Imma your faithful [grandmother] wishes eternal salvation in the Lord.

After your trusty messenger N. came to us, and gave me your letter, I gladly strove to do whatever I could recognize as expedient in it. It is for you to consider and weigh well how the things you are arranging to do among yourselves shall be found to be not only expedient but also right on both sides, and to see that there shall be no just reason to find fault with those who for the sake of the advantage of many . . . that which . . . to do. . . . This I see can only come about if everything be done at its proper time, because, as you know very well, only those things have good results, in Solomon's opinion, and are rightly done which are done at their proper time. I hope, my dear son, you will ever prosper in Christ.

Ep. 39. *Einhard to Gozbert.* (T. 2; J. 22.)

Date not later than 836 as Gozbert, abbot of St. Gall, died in that year.

To the revered Abbot Gozbert, devout servant of Christ, Einhard, sinner.

I pray that your Holiness will deign to take notice as to the case of this man, Bebo by name, that I gave him a benefice attached to the monastery of St. Cloud,[1] because he served me to my satisfaction. And after I had commended him to my lord Lothar, I obtained from my lord the Emperor the confirmation to him of that benefice for all the days of his life. Therefore I ask and beg of your dearly beloved self that you will not suffer any obstacle to be put in his way as to the benefice until, the Lord willing, I shall have an opportunity to confer with you. I am writing you this because I learn of the wicked desires and boundless greed of certain persons who have no care for the injury to their neighbour in cases where they have the power to satisfy their own most grasping greed. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 39a. *Einhard to Servatus Lupus.*

[1] Reading doubtful, as also identification with the abbey of that name near Paris.

This letter on the death of Imma is not found among Einhard's epistles in the manuscript or the printed collections but among those of Servatus Lupus: *Mon. Germ. Hist. Epistolarum*, tom. VI., pars I. (*Karolini aevi*, IV.), Berlin, 1902, p. 9 f. The present numbering is given to preserve the identity of the numbering in this translation with the text in *M. G. H.* and the chronological sequence. The date is about April, 836.

Einhard to his Lupus,[1] greeting.

All my interest and all my solicitude in regard to affairs of my own or my friends have been taken away and wholly dissipated by the profound grief I have experienced from the death not long ago of my faithful wife and that recently of a most dear sister and companion. And it seems impossible that it should end, for my memory clings so tenaciously to the thought of such deaths that it cannot be wholly torn from it. More than this, the grief itself is constantly added to and the wound received aggravated by the fact that my prayers have not been suffered to be of any avail and the hopes that I had built upon the merits and intercession of the martyrs[2] have completely disappointed my expectations. Thus it comes about that the words of condoling friends, which are apt to heal the melancholy of others, cause my heart's sore to become raw again and open afresh, when they bid me bear with calmness the blows of fortune which they do not themselves feel, and think that I ought to rejoice in a thing in which they are unable to point out a single trace of joy or gladness. For what mortal who has his wits and a sound mind does not bewail his lot and judge himself unhappy and most miserable when plunged into affliction he finds Him, who he had believed would listen to his prayers, alienated and inexorable? Do not these things seem to you such as might call forth sighs and tears from a puny little man,[3] drive him to groans and lamentations, even plunge him into the depths of despair? And verily

[1] Born 814, scholar at Fulda under Hrabanus Maurus, 830–836, abbot of Ferrières 842, died 862.

[2] *I. e.* SS. Marcellinus and Peter.

[3] Einhard was actually a very small man.

they would have done so unless, supported by the help of the divine pity, I had suddenly turned to the inquiry what in cases or disasters of this sort our elders and betters had decided should be held to and observed. There were at hand excellent teachers, by no means to be despised but every way to be listened to and followed, the glorious martyr Cyprian, to wit, and those most illustrious expounders of Holy Writ, Augustine and Jerome. Encouraged by their views and salutary argumentation, I tried to raise up my heart weighed down with heavy woe, and began to think over sedulously what I ought to feel in regard to the death of my dear partner whose mortality rather than her life I saw was ended. I even tried to see whether I could not make myself accomplish in myself by reasoning that which length of time is wont to bring about, namely, that the wound which a sudden accident had inflicted upon my heart through an unexpected death should begin to form a cicatrix and to heal through the application of self-consolation. But the extent of the hurt resists skilled treatment, and though the things offered by the aforesaid teachers for the mitigation of deep grief are most salutary, like remedies tried by physicians at once most skilful and most gentle, the wound which is still bleeding is not yet ripe for healing.

You will perhaps wonder at this and say that pain born of an occasion of this kind ought not to have been so lasting, as if it were in the power of the sufferer when that should end, the beginning of which he did not have in his power and did not foresee. Yet the extent or duration of pain and sorrow seems capable of measurement by the amount of the losses which have befallen one, and when I feel these so terribly every day in every act, in every occupation, in the whole management of my home and household, in ordering and arranging all the things that have to do with sacred or secular duties, how can it be that the wound which has brought all these great troubles upon me should not rather, when thus frequently touched, reopen and break forth anew than heal or be made whole? For I think and do not fear that this idea will deceive me, that the pain and anxiety which have come upon me from the death of my dear partner will abide with me forever until that period of time which God has willed to bestow upon me for this poor temporal life shall reach its

due ending be finished. Yet I find this profitable rather than harmful thus far, since it checks and holds back as by bridle or reins my mind that would hasten to joy and well-being, and recalls to the remembrance of death the heart that the repose and forgetfulness of old age had lured to hope and love of length of days. I see that I have not much time left to live, though how much it is destined to be is wholly unknown to me, but this I know most certainly, that both a new-born child may shortly die and an old man cannot live long. And according y I hold that it will be far more expedient and blessed to pass that brief uncertain time in grief than in joy. Because if according to the Lord's words blessed and happy are they that mourn and grieve, on the other hand they shall be unhappy and wretched who do not fear to pass the end of their days in constant and continuous joy.

I thank you and am grateful to your affection that you have deigned to comfort me with your letter, for you could not have given a greater or surer proof of your love towards me than by holding out the hand of exhortation to me as I lie in distress and by bidding me to rise whom you could not fail to know overwhelmed in heart and crushed down with sorrow. Fare thee well, most dear and beloved son.

Ep. 40. *Einhard to the Emperor Ludwig the Pious.* (T. 61; J. 24.)

The appearance of the comet about which Einhard writes is recorded in the Annals of Fulda as taking place April 11, 837.

The ancients almost all judged that the appearance of new and unusual stars indicated that things sinister and sad rather than pleasant and prosperous were to come upon poor mortals. Only the writings of the Holy Gospel bear witness to the apparition of a new star that was propitious, and we are told that the wise men of the Chaldæans saw it, and inferring from its tremendous brilliancy that the Eternal King had just been born, offered with reverence gifts befitting such high majesty.

But that star which recently appeared is reported by all who say that they saw it to have been harsh and gloomy of aspect and

to have flashed in a threatening manner. This, I think, forms a presage in consonance with our deserts, and indicates the coming of the disaster which we deserve. For what difference does it make whether threatening wrath is foretold to the human race by a man or an angel or a star? The essential thing is to understand that the apparition of the star was not casual but was a warning to mortals to strive to avoid the danger to come by penitence and appeals to the mercy of the Lord. So in the prophecy of Jonah, the overthrow of the city, which had been foretold by him, was postponed by the divine mercy because men turned to the remedy of repentance,[1] and God acted towards the people as He promised through Jeremiah to do when He commanded him to go down to the house of the potter, and to hear His words there beside the artisan as he worked.[2] This we trust that He will also do towards us if, like those men of old, we neglect not to repent with all our hearts.

And O that the disaster which a Norman fleet[3] is said to have brought recently upon parts of this realm might have atoned for the sins indicated by this terrible star! But I fear that what was signified by so deadly a portent is to be visited by a heavier punishment, although those upon whom such a mighty tempest from the ocean fell so furiously would seem to have suffered a harsh and heavy enough vengeance on themselves and all theirs.

May my most pious lord, the Emperor, flourish and live happily in all things!

Ep. 41. *Einhard to a Count.* (T. 63; J2. 5.)

This letter seems to call for the year 839 as date, when Ludwig the Pious, once more reconciled with Lothar, took measures to secure against Ludwig of Bavaria that portion of the contemplated future division of the Empire assigned to Lothar.

To the grand and honoured and illustrious man, glorious Count N., Einhard wishes eternal salvation in the Lord.

My lord the Emperor commanded through Dagolf the hunter

[1] *Cf.* Jonah 3:10. [2] *Cf.* Jer. 18:2 ff. [3] June 17, 837.

that Count N. should cause all the counts who are in Austrasia[1] to come together into one place, that is, Hatto and Poppo and Gebehard, and their comrades, to consider what must be done if anything new came up as to the regions of Bavaria. Then it seemed well to them that both you and Atto should attend the same assemblage. Therefore they ask you to consider, and send them word in what sort of place you think their meeting can best be held. For N. thinks this might be desirable.

Ep. 42. *Einhard to Hrabanus.* (T. 17; J. 42.)

There is nothing to determine the date of this letter except the accession of Hrabanus in 822 and the death of Einhard in 840.

To the revered servant of Christ, the reverend Abbot Hrabanus,[2] Einhard, sinner.

A vassal of yours, Gundhart by name, has asked me to intercede for him with your Holiness, that he may be allowed to absent himself from the muster which is to take place at this time, and may stay at home without offence to you, nay, with your approval. He asserts that he is driven to this staying at home by strong necessity in as much as he is involved in a quarrel and does not dare to attend this muster with his enemies and men who are plotting against his life, especially with that count under whose command the muster is to be, who, he says, is a most bitter enemy to him. Therefore he asks that he may not be pushed into such danger by authoritative order of yours. He will attend to making provision to pacify the collector of the heerban if he comes and summons him, and will do it without putting you to any trouble. I should not appeal to you in this case if I had not assured myself of the man's difficulties and dangers. I hope that you will ever flourish.

Ep. 43. *Einhard to Otgar.* (T. 4; J. 36.)

This and the following epistles are of very uncertain dates. In several cases the earliest possible date may be found, but the latest is with few exceptions only determined by the death of Einhard himself.

[1] *I.e.* the Frankish territory east of the Rhine.

[2] Abbot of Fulda 822–842.

To his holy and deservedly revered lord, the reverend Archbishop Otgar,[1] Einhard, sinner.

This brother, Werdric by name, is of the Congregation of St. Boniface[2] and is tarrying with us by permission of his abbot, because he is related to me. I now send him to you, that you may order him to be ordained deacon if you see that this can be done canonically because of the reason which is contained in the letter of his abbot recently addressed to me when I asked him about the case. I send you by this same brother that letter also to read, and you will immediately see from it, I think, whether the consecration can be performed now or should be put off till another time. I hope and pray that the heavenly grace will always and everywhere guard your Holiness in devoted service to itself, most holy and reverend Father.

Ep. 44. *Einhard to Otgar.* (T. 8; J. 38.)

To the holy and deservedly revered lord, the reverend Archbishop Otgar.

A certain presbyter, Hruodrad by name, has come to me saying that he belongs to your tributary town of Mayen[3] and had received permission from your suffragan bishop[4] and the other brethren to go to Rome and that in the month of March, but afterwards, when he had reached Mainz, he could not find people with whom he could carry out that journey. Therefore he betook himself to a certain man of our gau, Hildebert by name to stay with him until he should find people going to Rome. These he says he has now found, and he has asked me to secure your permission for his carrying out the journey. For he wishes, as he declares, to carry out the journey as speedily as possible and return to his own dwelling-place. Therefore I pray your Holiness to deign to bestow upon him the permission which he asks, and not to let it prejudice his case that he has tarried so long on the way, because many obstacles arose in his path and he did against his will what he could not help doing. I hope your Holi-

[1] Archbishop of Mainz 826–847.

[2] *I.e.* of the Monastery of Fulda.

[3] *Manniacum*, identification uncertain; Teulet identifies the place as in text.

[4] Lat. *Chorepiscopus; v.* Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, ii., 164 ff.

ness will remember my feeble self and will ever flourish in Christ, most holy and reverend Father.

Ep. 45. *Einhard to Hetti.* (T. 10; J. 23.)
Written after 828 when the relics came from Rome.

To his holy and deservedly revered lord, the reverend Archbishop Hetti,[1] Einhard, sinner.

Having learned from the letter of your Holiness what you wish, I have attended to doing it without delay, namely the sending to you the relics which you wrote that you wished to have for the dedication of your new basilica.[2] And I have done it gladly, having such confidence in you that I am sure that the honour which we ought to have shown to their whole bodies, had not sloth and negligence stood in the way of the honour due, will be shown to whatever bit of the sacred ashes of the blessed martyrs comes to you.

In regard, however, to the matter you wished to learn from me, I am quite unable to give you information, for almost nothing is apt to come to my knowledge from there, nor am I much interested in the knowledge of these things, from which I derive little pleasure and no profit. I hope that your Holiness, will remember my feeble self, and will ever flourish in the Lord, most holy and reverend Father.

Ep. 46. *Einhard to Hatto.* (T. 16; J. 41.)

To my beloved friend Hatto,[3] glorious count, Einhard wishes eternal salvation in the Lord.

A vassal of yours, Hunno by name, has come to the shrine of Saints Marcellinus and Peter asking pardon for having joined to himself in marriage without your bidding a fellow serf belonging to you.[4] Therefore I beg your kind self to let him attain indulgence in this matter if you find his fault worthy of pardon. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

[1] Archbishop of Trier 814–847.

[2] Almost any church building was called a basilica.

[3] *Cf.* Ep. 41.

[4] Serfs might not marry without consent of their masters and paying a *maritagium; cf.* Ep. 37.

Ep. 47. *Einhard to Poppo.* (T. 7; J. 37.)

This letter and the two following deal with the right of sanctuary; *cf.* Löning, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts*, ii, 355.

To the grand, honoured, and illustrious man, glorious Count Poppo,[1] Einhard sends greeting in the Lord.

Two poor men have taken refuge at the shrines of Christ's blessed martyrs, Marcellinus and Peter, admitting that they are guilty and have been convicted before you of a certain theft which they committed by stealing big game in a nobleman's woods. A part of the fine they have paid and part they still have to pay, but, as they declare, they have not the means of paying because of their poverty. Accordingly I pray your Kindness to deign, so far as is possible, to spare them for love of Christ's martyrs with whom they have sought refuge, that they may not be utterly ruined for a transgression of the sort, but may feel that it has profited them in your eyes to have sought refuge at the tombs of the holy martyrs. I hope that you may ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 48. *Einhard to Marchrad.* (T. 18; J. 43.)

To our beloved friend Marchrad, glorious Vidame, Einhard wishes eternal salvation in the Lord.

Two serfs of St. Martin's,[2] from Hedabach,[3] Williramnus and Otbert by name, have fled to the shrine of Christ's blessed martyrs, Marcellinus and Peter, because their brother had killed a companion of his, and they ask that they be allowed to pay the proper weregild for their brother, and that he be exempted from punishment in life and limb. Accordingly I ask your beloved self to deign to spare him as far as is possible, for the love of God and of His saints at whose shrine the brothers have sought refuge. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 49. *Einhard to a Clergyman.* (T. 50; J. 47.)

[1] *Cf.* Epp. 8 and 41.

[2] *I. e.* of the see of Mainz.

[3] Probably either Haibach or Aschaffenburg.

To the holy and deservedly venerated reverend lord, N., Einhard, sinner.

A serf of St. Mary's, N. by name, who belongs in the jurisdiction of your Holiness, has come to the shrine of Christ's blessed martyrs, Marcellinus and Peter, asking indulgence because of a crime he has committed in killing a companion as the result of a quarrel which arose between them. Accordingly I pray your Holiness to deign to spare him out of reverence for these martyrs at whose shrine he has sought refuge, and, remitting punishment in limb and by scourging, to allow him by a payment of money to compound and repair the wrong which he has done in evil intent. I hope your Holiness will ever flourish in Christ, most holy and reverend Father.

Ep. 50. *Einhard to a Count.* (T. 50; J. 47.)
Date not earlier than 828.

To the grand and honoured, and illustrious man, N., glorious Count, Einhard wishes everlasting salvation in the Lord.

Trusting greatly in your friendship . . . I do not hesitate to ask about the rights of the blessed martyrs of Christ, Marcellinus and Peter, which are in your monastery,[1] and also about certain slaves . . . which our advocate,[2] N. sought for in person with you and hopes he can get if he has your help. Accordingly I beg your kind self to deign to aid him not only in this matter but also in other things, to the end that you may through this win the aforesaid martyrs of Christ as your champions and intercessors with God.

Ep. 51. *Einhard to a Count and a Judge.* (T. 33; J. 57.)

To his beloved brothers in Christ and friends, Count N. and Judge N., glorious *Missi* of our lord the Emperor, Einhard sends greeting in the Lord.

Our men who come to us from those parts are in the habit of telling us of your good-will and kindness towards us, in that

[1] So text, but *ministerium, i. e.* jurisdiction, makes better sense (so Teulet). The title of the person addressed bears this out.

[2] *Cf.* Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, ii., 614 ff; *Encyc. Brit.*, ed. xi., *s. v.* Advocate.

you save our men and spare them in every situation in which you can spare them, as well in the heerban as in other matters coming under your commissionership. Hence we would show you great gratitude as we should, and we pray God and His saints[1] that not only here in this present life but also in the future life the recompense of the fitting reward of your deeds be vouchsafed you. We also promise that you may confidently hold our humble selves ever ready to do your will. Fare you well.

Ep. 52. *Einhard to Gerward.* (T. 14; J. 39.)
Date between 830 and 840.

To his beloved brother Gerward, Einhard wishes everlasting salvation in the Lord.

I am uncertain whether I ought to think that you did not understand my letter or that you did not care about my danger, but I am more readily led to believe that in consequence of some preoccupation you did not read and understand with enough care what I wrote than to think that your affection lacked interest in the danger threatening me.

For you urge me, nay, advise me, to give up guarding the martyrs, which I have been ordered to do unceasingly on the spot, and make for the Court, since a week's absence is reported as likely to turn out to my disadvantage. But this cannot be averted, not only as far as sojourning at Court is concerned, but even as to the journey necessary to reach the Court, especially by me who both because of the difficulties of the way and my feeble bodily health have seldom been able to get from Aix to the shrines of the martyrs in less than a week. But now I ask and urgently pray that you read again and understand what I wrote to you, and disdain not to write back to me, as I some time ago asked in my letter, what you think best as to that revelation and the orders by which I am bound. There will be no lack of messengers if you wish to send what you write to my Vidame, Bonottus.[2] I hope that you will ever flourish in the Lord, most dear and loving brother and lord.

[1] This may refer to Marcellinus and Peter; if so the date is after 828.
[2] *Cf.* Ep. 5.

Ep. 53. *Einhard to the Monks of Seligenstadt.* (T. 64; J. 48.)

Possibly the date is after 834 as the monastery does not seem to have been roofed until that year; *cf.* Epp. 33 and 36.

In the name of the Most High God. N., sinner, to the beloved brethren abiding in the monastery of Christ's blessed martyrs, Marcellinus and Peter, everlasting salvation in the Lord.

Be it known to your Brotherhood that with the help of the Lord I am safe and sound, and desire to read and know the same of you. And I admonish your Brotherhood to see to it diligently that you remember me as you have promised before the holy martyrs, my patron saints, whom you are in the way of serving daily, that the Lord in loving kindness may grant me to find you safe through their intercession. . . . I exhort you, therefore with fatherly solicitude, beloved brethren, to be mindful of your promise, and ever solicitously to take care to commend yourselves to the Lord and his saints, that the ancient enemy may not be able to snare you or by any cleverness lead you astray. Constantly intent upon the praise of God and . . . and obedience, attending the churches of God, and helping each other . . . , bearing one another's burdens, shall you be able the more easily to win the eternal kingdom here . . . through the favour of Christ and his holy martyrs. With these . . . are, I speak according to the Apostle, priests of Christ, with all honour and diligence . . . an ensample to the younger brethren . . . days that shall come, in kindness . . . one another . . . and gladly persist to the joys of Easter, by divine grace . . . study to keep your . . . as I have given them to you. And devote yourselves to showing all obedience to your vows and all diligence, that your honour may be unsullied in the future, and the profit of your souls show vast increase from day to day by the Lord's help. May your holy Brotherhood prosper and flourish . . . My loving brethren.

And let this my letter be solemnly read before all the brethren, and its dictates obeyed.

Ep. 54. *Einhard to Bishop James.* (T. 5; J. 53.)

The only indication of date is that the only bishop by

the name of James in this period was Chorepiscopus of Langres and his name occurs between 820 and 838 in connection with a certain Bishop Alberic.

To the most revered bishop, James, reverend in Christ, Einhard, sinner.

This cleric, Otmar by name, has brought me a letter from your Holiness in which you ask me to give this same cleric permission to abide with you, though he was born and brought up in this region, and after considering the character of the case I have decided to comply with your request in such fashion that this same cleric shall have permission to abide with you as you ask, along with his brothers and mother, but shall pay his dues each year at St. Servais,[1] as has been appointed by our brethren. And the matter of the ordination of this same cleric shall be in your hands to do whatever you think best about it. For you are conversant with his morals and walk, and know whether he is fit to take some holy order upon himself. I hope your Holiness will keep me in remembrance and ever flourish in Christ.

Ep. 55. *Einhard to Liuthard and Erembert.* (T. 12; J. 54.)

In the name of Christ. Abbot Einhard to his faithful presbyter, Liuthard, and Vidame, Erembert, greeting in the Lord.

Be it known to you that we have enjoined upon Willibald, our faithful presbyter, as we believe, to receive our dues from our vassals both at St. Bavon and at the Monastery of Blandin.[2] Therefore we send him to you, because we wish you to aid him in receiving the same dues both fully and in good money; and when he has received them, we wish you to aid him in opportunity to bring them to us. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 56. *Einhard to a Vidame* (?). (T. 24; J. 28.)

Possibly addressed to the same as the preceding letter; *cf.* Epp. 26.

In the name of Christ, Einhard, the abbot, to N., greeting in the Lord.

[1] In Maastricht. [2] Both at Ghent.

I notify you that we need wax for our service here, and cannot find it in these regions, because there has been but a small production of honey these last two years in these quarters. Therefore I wish you to consider and arrange with N. to have, if possible, a donkey load come with our vassals who are returning to us from those parts after the feast of St. Bavon.[1] Fare you well, and pray for us.

Ep. 57. *Einhard to Vussin.* (T. 30; J. 56.)

To my dear son Vussin greeting in the Lord.

For I fear and am very much afraid, my son, that having left the fold you may not be able to help forgetting yourself and me. For immature youth, unless restrained by the bridle of discipline, finds it hard to keep to the way of righteousness. Therefore, my child, study to emulate the upright, and offend in no way him[2] whom I have always been urging you to follow. Mindful of your profession, lay hold upon learning his commands and all that he approves to whom you have committed your whole self. Taught by this and trained in the practice of it, you will lack none of the benefits of life's knowledge. As I have said to you in conversation, cultivate eagerness to learn, and leave nothing untouched that you can acquire of the grand branches of knowledge from the brilliant and copious ability of the great speaker. Above all, remember to emulate the uprightness in which he excels, for language and rhetoric and the other branches of liberal knowledge are vain things and harmful to the servants of God, unless by divine grace they are seen to be the basis of good character. For "knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth" [1 Cor. viii., 1]. I would rather see you dead than puffed up and teeming with sins. For the Saviour directed us to learn not the miracles he did but gentleness and lowliness of heart. Why continue? You have often heard me say these things and others of the sort. May you some day delight in those things by which through God's help purity of heart and body is attained.

I send you, therefore, such obscure words and names from

[1] October 1st.

[2] Possibly Hrabanus Maurus.

the books of Vitruvius[1] as happened to occur to me for the moment, that you may seek a knowledge of them from the same place. And I believe that the greater part of them can be made clear to you through the little box which Master E. made with ivory pillars after the fashion of old-time works. And with regard to what Vitruvius calls perspective look up what Virgil calls a stage-setting in the third book of the *Georgics*. He says, "[how] it is pleasant [to lead the solemn procession] to the shrines, and see the slain bullocks, or how the stage-setting shifts as the side scenes are turned, and how the Britons woven into it raise the crimson curtain." Farewell.

Ep. 58. *Einhard to a Friend.* (T. 36; J. 58.)

To his beloved brother and very dear friend N., Einhard wishes eternal salvation in the Lord.

Count N. has asked me to beg you to allow him to keep those swine that you sent to his territory to feed until they become fatter and better and he can buy them for the Lord's service at a fair price. For, knowing our friendship, he thought I could obtain this from you, and I, confident in your affection, ask that you will not disdain to comply with his wish in this matter. I hope you will ever prosper in the Lord.

Ep. 59. *Einhard to a Friend.* (T. 38; J. 59.)

Einhard to his beloved Brother N., greeting in the Lord.

I wish you would order Egmunel in my name to make me sixty square tiles measuring two feet on each side and four inches thick, and two hundred smaller ones measuring ten inches each way and three inches thick. I send you word by this man about the sorrel[2] seed which I wish you would have sown in a wide place. It is wont to grow into a large crop. Fare you well.

Ep. 60. *Einhard to a Vassal.* (T. 55; J. 60.)
Cf. Ep. 37.

[1] Einhard was occupied while at Court in erecting churches and palaces for both Charles and Ludwig.

[2] Reading obscure.

In the name of Christ. Einhard, abbot, greeting to our trusty man.

You know that according to my ability I have taken pains to comply with your wish in causing your daughter to be returned to you. Therefore I ask you for the honour and love of St. N. and of me to agree with me in this, that, if I get that man made free, you will allow him to receive this same daughter of yours in marriage, because it seems to me better that she be united again to that man if he is made free than that she be rejected by all men. Fare you well.

Ep. 61. *Einhard to R.* (T. 56; J. 29.)

Einhard to his dear son[1] R., eternal salvation in the Lord.

The man you sent to me came on the twenty-third of August, and since you wrote that you had no doubt of his fidelity I have not hesitated to entrust to him everything that I wanted to have reach you. For I judge it better to trust to a faithful man than to paper, for if a paper or parchment slips from the bearer, everything secret that it contains is disclosed, but a trusty messenger will not betray his trust even under torture. All, therefore, that I should have wished to say to you if you were present, I have indicated in an intimate way to your faithful man, whom I have found devoted to you and faithful in all things, especially because he neither concealed nor evaded anything of what you charged him to say. I hope you are well.

Ep. 62. *Einhard to a Vassal.* (T. 56; J. 61.)

In the name of Christ. Einhard, a humble abbot, to one faithful and beloved, eternal salvation in Christ.

I doubt not that you remember how you committed yourself and yours to me, and since your own will decreed that it be so, it is my duty in turn, whenever opportunity arises, to give you and yours worthy support in every way so far as I know how and have the ability. Be it known, therefore, to your beloved self that that vassal of ours and your daughter desire with the Lord's favour and your consent to obtain each other as man and wife.

[1] There is no internal evidence that R. was more than a pupil.

Therefore I have determined to send to you messengers to inform you that it seems suitable to the mother and brother and all the relatives, if it is your pleasure, that it be done. Moreover I not only wish that it be confirmed, but if you give me authority to carry it through, I desire in honourable fashion as quickly as may be, to provide worthily both in the matter of benefices and of other things. Moreover this same vassal will give the dowry and is increasing the gifts, and the only thing left is that you should either come yourself without delay to conclude the matter now or give me permission to conclude it. For we know what with God's favour we can do at the present moment, but what a day may bring forth we know not. Hence it is written, let not thy hand nor thy foot be idle, but do with all thy might what thy hand findeth to do. Saying no more on this, therefore, I will ask you to hasten to inform me about this matter by letter through this messenger. . . . Fare you well . . . Christ.

Ep. 63. *Einhard to a Bishop.* (T. 59; J. 62.)

To the holy and deservedly revered lord, N., priest of the Most High God, Einhard, sinner.

This vassal, Agantheo[1] by name, is my relative, and has been for some time in my service, but in as much as he now desires to pass his days under your dominion, my humble self is pleased that he has chosen to be in a place of such friendly relations to me, and I have therefore determined to give him this letter of recommendation, that through my intervention he may have easier access to your Holiness and may find a home with you because I declare him to be related to me. I beg you, therefore, to deign to receive him, and take him into your service. I think you will not find him an unprofitable servitor. I hope you will ever prosper in the Lord.

Ep. 64. *Einhard to a Bishop.* (T. 60; J. 63.)

Einhard to the deservedly revered lord N.

Because of a scarcity of ministrants of the altar, necessity forces me to petition your Holiness to deign to ordain this cleric, by name N., as deacon. For not only in age but also in learn-

[1] Reading doubtful.

ing he is suitable for this. Therefore I send him to your kind presence, that we may receive him back consecrated by you in the aforesaid rank. I hope you will ever flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 65. *Einhard to an Unknown Person.* (T. 62; J. 64.)

To his beloved and revered brother in Christ, N., Einhard wishes everlasting salvation in the Lord.

. . . of my man N . . . are ready . . . your swine.[1] For thus I have been told, and in as much as this same N. has ong served me devotedly and faithfully, I ask your dear self, so far as it can be done, to deign to spare him in the matter of that composition for which he is in debt to you by law; that I may find him useful for my service and you may justly find me ever more ready and eager to do your bidding. I hope you will ever prosper.

Ep. 66. *Einhard* (?) *to a King* (?). (T. 65; J. 66.)

This letter appears to be addressed to some King or Emperor. It seems most probably to be by Einhard and to Ludwig the Pious. His restoration to the imperial dignity was decided on Feb. 2, 835 (Feast of the Purification of the B. V. M.) at a council held at Diedenhofen.

A lowly person presumes to offer to the loving kindness of a splendid lord some pieces of prayer. They are so many chants and other prayers to follow the Purification of the Blessed Virgin. So may the King Immortal give you safety in the present life, and cause you to rejoice with His saints in glory celestial forever!

The hand that through the loving kindness of God reigns over life forever raised up the Key-bearer that he might not be drowned in the sea.[2]

Ep. 67. *To a Bishop.* (T. 66; J. 67.)

Epp. 67–71 were written neither by Einhard nor to him. They were included in the collection as preserved in the manuscript probably because they relate to St. Bavon of

[1] Text in bad condition.

[2] *Cf.* Matt. 14:30–32.

Ghent. There is no means of determining their date with any exactness.

Your most humble retainers would bring before the eyes of their most excellent bishop the marks of their specially willing service, and indicate that their devotion is ready to the extent of possibility, if your kindly Highness will only deign to command. They promise freely, in all obedience to you and yours, and whether near your gracious presence or wherever you bid them sojourn, to comply with your sweet commands. And now, though with nothing to deserve it, they yet trust to the words of your promise, and do not hesitate to remind your loving Piety of it. Your Blessedness, farewell!

Ep. 68. *To a Count.* (T. 67; J. 68.)
Text is in bad condition as indicated.

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. To N. by favour of the divine grace Count and his friend . . . [hard] wishes the everlasting safety of salvation in the Lord.

. . . I reciprocate your welcome affection, for I have found . . . which savours of the advantage of profitableness. This kindly intention of your servant . . . supported by the clemency . . . devoted. Therefore I beg by this letter . . . that you will not hesitate to show the same kind favour in regard to my servants. They are men who . . . torn away . . . in your monastery . . . and their inheritance among the possessions of St. Bavon . . . tried to come to me . . . and . . . in obedience to me . . . Therefore I ask that the prebend[1] which their predecessors . . . have retained thus far for your benefices, hereafter the aforesaid clerics of ours [Ludwig] and Gozzil . . . may enjoy the use of the prebend and when . . . and desire to visit their friends, in all things which they need fortified by [your] protection . . . that no one may venture to . . . evil intent against. . . . May your beloved self do, as I think . . . may your dear self flourish in the Lord.

Ep. 69. *To a Chaplain of the Empress.* (T. 68; J. 69.)

[1] Prebend is any salary or stated income either in money or in kind.

To the honoured and exalted master, filled with the spirit of wisdom, the private Chaplain[1] of our lady, the Empress,[2] we [Goceli . . . and . . .] your faithful retainers, by this writing in our humble name, desire everlasting salvation to your Blessedness.

May your good self be pleased to remember the matter of which we once spoke, and, as you encouraged us and gave generous promises, so take pains to carry them out with him whom you know, and discover whether we should apply to him or somewhere else, and deign to send us word quickly either by a trusty messenger or by letter. For in accordance with the great confidence we have in you, we write you thus boldly of our need. And deign to inform us of your welfare, for your health is our joy and your joy is our delight. We pray and long for this and desire to hear that it last for many happy years. May you flourish now and always, glorious man, in Christ Jesus and all his saints. Amen.

Ep. 70. *To a Noble.* (T. 69; J. 70.)

Most faithful and devoted and ever ready slaves of your supreme Excellency,[3] we V. and Gl. approach in faithful and eager service your glorious Lordship of illustrious rank and most noble highness, M.

The heartiest thanks, and if it were possible [more], we offer your Highness for having granted assent to our prayer and having brought to accomplishment the matter of the chapel at Lens.[4] But your representative R., who came to invest us with it accordingly, would have done so exactly as you had ordered, had not your brother W's men opposed this. Yet the place is terribly dilapidated and no sheltering roof remained anywhere that has not been sold,[5] sequestrated, or laid waste, except the basilica,

[1] Possibly Walafrid Strabo, chaplain 829–838.

[2] Possibly Judith.

[3] Here, as elsewhere in these letters, the honorifics and terms of address are not titles.

[4] Lens-St. Servais in the province of Liège.

[5] The lead was frequently stripped from roofs and sold; dilapidation speedily followed loss of lead.

which also is partially in ruins. But we have determined because of your generosity to spend . . . upon the restoration of the place all that . . . we can take in this year, and this we desire to do, if things remain as your Excellency decided and decreed. Your representative, therefore, found nothing of the works you are making there, because everything had been laid waste except the seigniorial tithe which he ordered saved in your name. Whether we should . . . or not, we are wholly without knowledge. We set this forth to your sublime Highness, that your Highness may consider and determine how it can be restored, so that no danger may come to anyone because a building dedicated to God has been neglected and let go to pieces. Whatever is therefore the pleasure of your Excellency in the premises, deign to indicate to our humble selves by your representative. May Christ keep your sublime Highness long, and also bring you into life eternal. Amen.

Ep. 71. *From the Same* (?) *to the Same* (?). (T. 70; J. 71.)

To the prominent, distinguished, and excellent nobleman, N., we, W. and G., devoted and submissive in all things to your sublime Highness, offer you our faithful obedience and service in all things.

Since your sublime Highness has been pleased to put a service upon our humble selves, we would make known to your Highness the reason why the same has not yet been brought to completion. Your brother's cleric, A., whom at your orders we associated with ourselves in the service, took away with him the little list which you sent to our humble selves, in order to make excuses to your brother in our behalf because the work in accordance with your service remained unaccomplished, and in this little list were carried away the measurements which you transmitted to us, and thus far we have not been able to recover them. Therefore transmit the measurements to us, and to the best of our ability we will take pains to carry out your orders. We hope that your sublime Highness prospers unceasingly in the Lord.

33.01²

DATE DUE

BR 140.5 .A531 1913 v.1

,012

Papers of the American Society
of Church History

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BR140.5 .A531
Papers of the American Soc
3 0645 0000 1875 0